

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: Petition of sundry members of Follansbee Lodge, No. 1, Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, favoring the passage of legislation to restore order and civic liberty in the town of Winton, W. Va.; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of the council of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the council of the city of Youngstown, State of Ohio, and the council of the city of Schenectady, of the State of New York, favoring the national ownership of the telegraph and telephone systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of Fulton Grange, No. 66, Patrons of Husbandry, protesting against the repeal of the administration feature of the parcel-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 7449) for the relief of Harriett Randle; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the board of education of San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 5; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Charles T. Jacobs, of San Jose, Cal., favoring the passage of the Page bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Utah, protesting against mutual life insurance funds in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of sundry life insurance companies of the United States, protesting against mutual life insurance funds in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the fruit dealers of Salt Lake City, Utah, protesting against the provisions of the tariff bill relating to bananas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. C. Watson, of Ogden, Utah, protesting against H. R. 4653, by Mr. Sabath; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Miss Mathilde Dorence, of the Salt Lake City High School, of Utah, protesting against a duty on books in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to William R. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the Ohio Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring the passage of H. R. 2972, to regulate the sale of gold-filled watch cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of Capron Camp, No. 22, of the State of New York, favoring the efforts of the watchmen, messengers, and gatekeepers at Ellis Island, Immigration Service, to improve their condition regarding compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of the State of New York, protesting against the proposed reduction in tariff rates on printed matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of W. A. Scott, Fargo, N. Dak., protesting against exempting mutual life insurance companies from the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, August 16, 1913.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. There are very few Senators here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Catron	James	Martin, Va.
Bacon	Clarke, Ark.	Johnson	Martine, N. J.
Bankhead	Crawford	Jones	Nelson
Borah	Cummins	Kenyon	O'Gorman
Brady	Dillingham	Kern	Overman
Brandegee	Fall	La Follette	Owen
Bristow	Gallinger	Lane	Page
Bryan	Gronna	Lodge	Perkins
Burton	Hollis	McLean	Pittman

Pomerene
Ransdell
Robinson
Saulsbury
Shafroth
Sheppard
Sherman

Shively
Simmons
Smith, Ariz.
Smith, Ga.
Smith, Mich.
Smith, S. C.
Smoot

Sterling
Sutherland
Swanson
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Tillman

Townsend
Vardaman
Walsh
Weeks
Williams

Mr. JAMES. My colleague [Mr. BRADLEY] is detained from presence here by reason of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. GALLINGER. The junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] is detained by illness, and probably will not return during the present session. I regret to say that he is unpaired.

Mr. LANE. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is unavoidably absent, and that he is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. GRONNA. My colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is necessarily absent, due to illness in his family. He is paired with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS].

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] are detained from the Senate on account of sickness. I will allow this notice to stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered on the roll call. A quorum is present.

MEMORIAL.

Mr. JONES. I present a memorial adopted at a meeting of the wholesale commission merchants and fruit dealers of Seattle, Wash., remonstrating against an import duty on bananas. I move that the memorial lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

THE TARIFF—RAW WOOL.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Thursday, the 21st instant, at the close of the morning business, I will address the Senate on the pending tariff bill, particularly with reference to raw wool.

INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL INSTITUTE.

Mr. O'GORMAN. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I report back favorably with amendments Senate resolution 141, in reference to the invitation of the Austrian Government to send official delegates to the Fourteenth International Statistical Institute, to be held at Vienna September 7 to 13, 1913, and I submit a report (No. 102) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It provides that we shall appoint, I think without expense, one or two representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. It will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. O'GORMAN July 24, 1913, as follows:

Whereas the Government of Austria has invited the Government of the United States to be represented by official delegates at the fourteenth session of the International Statistical Institute to be held at Vienna September 7 to 13, 1913: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Department of State is authorized to accept this invitation and appoint one or more official delegates to represent the United States at this session of the International Statistical Institute; Provided, Such arrangement can be made without requiring any special appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I may state that the committee reports an amendment authorizing the President of the United States to accept the invitation instead of the Department of State. The Secretary perhaps had better read the report.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hope the Senator will not require the report to be read, but let it be printed. I suggest to the Senator, if it leads to debate—

Mr. O'GORMAN. It will not. I am not anticipating one minute of discussion on it.

Mr. SIMMONS. If there is any debate, I hope the Senator will withdraw it.

Mr. O'GORMAN. There will be no debate. The convention is to take place in about three weeks, and it is necessary, if the President be authorized to accept the invitation, that he receive the authorization at once. The report is not long; it is very short.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will simply inquire of the Senator precisely what subjects are to be taken up at this session of the International Statistical Institute.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I will say that I know no more about it than the report itself indicates.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, there can be no objection to it.

Mr. O'GORMAN. It is a matter of courtesy.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask the Senator from New York one question. The wording of the resolution evidently carries the idea that there shall be no expense to the Government, and I understood the Senator to say that that is his understanding.

Mr. O'GORMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMOOT. Although I think the wording is that there shall be no expense provided for by a special appropriation. Let the Secretary report the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee recommend that the resolution be agreed to with the following amendments:

In line 1 strike out the words "Department of State" and insert in lieu thereof the words "President of the United States," and in line 5 strike out the word "special," so that the resolution will read:

Whereas the Government of Austria has invited the Government of the United States to be represented by official delegates at the fourteenth session of the International Statistical Institute to be held in Vienna September 7 to 13, 1913: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is authorized to accept this invitation and appoint one or more official delegates to represent the United States at this session of the International Statistical Institute: *Provided*, Such arrangement can be made without requiring any appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the amendment reported by the committee strikes out the word "special." That is what I was going to speak of, and ask the Senator to accept that amendment. Of course, if there is a request for an appropriation hereafter the Senator will see to it that such a request is not to be entertained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JONES. I ask the Senator from New York if the idea is that the President shall inquire around and see if he can find some private individual willing to spend his money to serve on this commission?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I assume that there are citizens of this country who are particularly interested in this work who will be very glad to receive a designation from the President to attend the conference; of course, at their own expense or that of the institute.

Mr. JONES. Do the delegates from the other countries have their expenses paid by their Governments or are they selected in the same way?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I do not know, but I may say to the Senator from Washington what is well known generally in this Chamber, that it frequently happens in accepting invitations of this character the resolutions provide that the President may send commissioners or representatives without expense to the Government.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator think that is a good custom?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I think so. For instance, there may be an international architectural conference, and at such a conference the architectural societies of the country would indicate one or two of their members, and the suggestion would be made that they be designated, and they would go at their own expense or at the expense of their society. Such resolutions come in very often.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 2998) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Burch (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDELL:

A bill (S. 2999) to foster commerce between the United States and foreign countries by facilitating the reexportation in bond from ports of the United States of goods imported into the United States, duly entered for warehousing, and stored in bonded warehouses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3000) for the relief of Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder, commodore on the retired list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

CONDITIONS IN MEXICO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from yesterday.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will inquire if that is the resolution introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is not to be present to-day, and I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Both resolutions? There are two of them.

Mr. GALLINGER. By the Senator from Pennsylvania?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; whatever resolutions were offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I know nothing about others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be passed over, then.

PROTECTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS IN MEXICO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolution coming over from a previous day.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is that the resolution offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. SIMMONS. I see that that Senator is not in his seat, and—

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from Washington is not in his seat just now. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over without prejudice. The morning business is closed.

Mr. BACON. What became of the last resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It went over.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3321.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, for the peace of mind of the Senators who for exterior reasons may be compelled to remain on the inside of this Chamber during my remarks I will say that I intend to occupy less time than my notes indicate.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a few items in the history of the plumage trade, and to that particular phase of the plumage trade which is involved in the pending tariff bill. I do this because I assume that it is a subject with which but few Senators are familiar and because I am encouraged to believe that every Member of this body is in sympathy with the general purposes of the amendment which I have offered.

As far back as 1876, Prof. Newton, of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and author of the British sea-birds preservation act of 1868, wrote to the London Times as follows:

Like others of my brother naturalists, I have been long aware by report of the enormous sales of birds' feathers which are being constantly held in London, but the particulars of them do not, except by accident, come before us. Chance has thrown in my way a catalogue, or portion of a catalogue, of one of these auctions, and its contents are such as to horrify me, for I had no conception of the amount of destruction to which exotic birds are condemned by fashion—an amount which can not fall speedily to extirpate some of the fairest members of creation, for I must premise, for the benefit of your nonornithological readers, that it is chiefly, if not solely, at the breeding season that the most beautiful, and therefore the most valuable, feathers are developed in birds.

The trade to which this statement refers was sustained by the wholesale destruction of the rarest and most beautiful birds in the world, wherever they might be found, and since that time the plumage trade has increased in its activity as the birds have decreased in numbers, until to-day it extends into every nook and corner of the earth where a bird of bright plumage may be found.

In 1886 the first Audubon society in this country was formed in Massachusetts, and the purpose of this society, together with that of the ornithologists' union, formed that same year, was—to discourage buying and wearing for ornamental purposes the feathers of any wild bird, and to further otherwise the protection of our native birds. We would awaken the community to the fact that this fashion of wearing feathers means the cruel slaughter of myriads of birds, and that some of our finest birds are already decimated.

In 1887 Mr. W. E. D. Scott, the naturalist, called the attention of the people of this country to the wholesale slaughter of the American plumage birds, this list including such birds as the plover, terns, sandpipers, and other varieties of the smaller game and insectivorous birds. Later I shall refer to some of the articles published by Mr. Scott.

In 1893 Mr. W. H. Hudson, the author of "The Naturalist in La Plata," said:

How long will women tolerate a fashion which involves such wholesale, wanton, and hideous cruelty as this? * * * If in every pulpit in the land this shocking story of the egrets were told, surely for once humanity would prove stronger than fashion. * * * Let it be clearly understood, once for all, that the feathered woman is a cruel woman; that for the sake of a passing fashion, which pleases no rational being and should disgust all who can think and feel and understand, she brings dishonor upon her sex and robs nature of its beauty without adding to her own.

Lord Lilford, president of the British Ornithologists' Union from 1867 to 1896, in his book, "Birds of the British Islands," said:

Here it would seem appropriate to notice the wanton destruction of this and many kindred species that has been carried on all the world over for many years past for no other purpose than the supply of the dorsal plumes for the supposed ornamentation of feminine and military headgear. In "the trade" these feathers are known as osprey, and the thoughtless fashion for them has caused the almost entire extinction of more than one species. I am delighted to believe that in this country, at least, a very considerable check has been put upon this atrocious business by the action of the Ladies' Society for the Protection of Birds, an association that can not be too widely made known or too highly commended. I would strongly urge all ladies who may honor me by reading these notes, to enroll themselves as members of this really beneficent society, whose only object is the preservation from wanton destruction of some of the most interesting and beautiful of organized creatures.

In 1899 Prof. Newton, in the Public Ledger, again tried to impress upon the British public the need of bird protection, and in speaking of the egret he said:

It is a fact known to everyone who will take the trouble to inquire that all these egrets are shot down at their breeding places while they are building their nests or rearing their young, and that if so be that the latter are hatched, they die of hunger on their parents' death, the breeding places being absolutely devastated by the plume hunters. The personal experience on this point of Mr. W. E. D. Scott, a competent and unimpassioned witness, has never been and can not be refuted as regards the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of North America, where these settlements of the birds are all but extinguished; but the same thing goes on all over the world wherever egrets are found in numbers sufficient to make their destruction a profitable enterprise.

In 1898 Lord Wolseley, commander in chief of the British army, forbade the wearing of osprey plumes by the army officers, giving it as his reason that the plumes were taken from the birds in the nesting season.

In 1902 the Government of India issued an ordinance prohibiting the exportation from British India of skins and feathers of all birds except the feathers of ostriches, and skins and feathers "exported bona fide as specimens of natural history."

If India 11 years ago could take this step, it seems to me the United States should be willing to prohibit their importation to-day.

A strong attempt was made by the feather trade to secure a modification of this ordinance; but as it was based upon a most thorough investigation the request of the feather trade was denied.

In 1906 Queen Alexandra of England took the matter up publicly and stated that she never wore egret plumes herself, and would certainly do all in her power to discourage the cruelty practiced on the beautiful birds.

In 1908 Lord Avebury introduced into the House of Lords a bill to prohibit the importation of plumage. It passed the House of Lords July 21, 1908, and was introduced into the House of Commons July 22, but did not reach its second reading before the close of the session. Similar bills have been introduced into the House of Commons since that time, but have failed to come to a vote.

The foregoing facts and quotations I have taken from a publication issued by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, published in London in 1911, entitled "Feathers and Facts."

The efforts of the feather traders to deceive the public and block legislative interference in England should throw considerable light on the present situation in this country. I quote again from the authority to which I have just referred:

The trade have been slow in taking serious steps to defend themselves, and the history of the defense is somewhat curious. Feathers having been proclaimed the fashion, it is evident that the feather importers relied on the belief that the voice of fashion was stronger than the voice of either science or humanity. Some little time, however, after the formation of the Society for the Protection of Birds and of the Sheldrake Society, when women all over the country were being made acquainted with the facts concerning the "osprey" or egret plume, the remarkable fraud of the "artificial osprey" came into existence. The egret feather was no longer to be labeled "real." Milliners' and drapers' assistants were instructed to assure lady customers that these delicate sprays were manufactured by the million out of quills and other material by an army of factory workers, who earned their living by this pleasant and artistic work. That the lie was detected and proclaimed by every naturalist who took one of the so-called artificial plumes in his hand made no difference whatever to the persistence and assurance with which it was affirmed and repeated.

The fraud flourished until the time of the House of Lords committee in 1908, when it became evident that the force of mere assertion and repetition, which had proved so successful with the uncritical public, would not stand investigation before a serious tribunal. The invention of "artificial ospreys" was suddenly discarded for that of "moulted feathers." The "artificial" osprey was admitted to be real, but it was no longer cruel to wear real plumes—they had been simply "picked up." That is, they had simply been picked out of the nests after the birds had raised their young and left them.

FICTION VERSUS FACT.

The possibility of an imitation osprey was never denied by the society; that such a thing might be made by ingenious manufacturers was pretty certain, though it could never stand the simple tests which at once reveal the true feather.

The aim of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds has been from the first to seek out facts. It investigated the facts concerning the ostrich feather and came to the conclusion that, although cruelty might be practiced, it was not necessarily involved in the procuring of the plumes and that the business stands on a wholly different plane from that which is dependent upon the killing of countless wild birds.

When the "artificial osprey" was heralded in the papers and in the milliners' shops the society asked again and again to be furnished with an artificial plume and to be directed to the factory where such things were made. As neither request was ever complied with, and as it was proved that the feathers of the heron and egret were being widely sold as artificial, it was only possible to form one conclusion.

When, shortly after the House of Lords committee made its report, a letter signed "Leon Laglaize" was being circulated the society took the same course. The letter did not commend itself to serious attention, since it was issued without the name of recipient or publisher and contained a statement with regard to herons' nests which was obviously untrue. Nevertheless the society wrote to the British representatives in the country concerned and published their replies in full. The proceeding of the trade in quoting a short extract from this evidence and suppressing the rest needs no comment.

VENEZUELA.

Mr. Downham, representing the plumage trade in 1908, says: "The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds has published, with one exception, nothing more than empty contradictions from people who have no experience or knowledge of the particular country or the conditions under which the feathers are collected. * * * The one exception, confirming the evidence obtained by the trade, is contained in a letter from His Britannic Majesty's minister in Venezuela, under date of January 14, 1909, directed to the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, and although it does not fully agree with all that has been published by the trade on the subject, it is undoubtedly a report which has been issued only after very careful investigations." (The Feather Trade, p. 30.)

HIS BRITANNIC MAJESTY'S MINISTER'S STATEMENT.

One portion of this report which "does not fully agree with all that has been published by the trade" is His Majesty's minister's verdict upon the evidence furnished to him and by him to the society:

"From the evidence before me I have no manner of doubt that the vast majority of the egret plumes exported to Europe are obtained by the slaughter of the birds during or about the breeding season, and that no effective regulations exist or, indeed, owing to local conditions, can exist for the control of this slaughter, and that the letter of Mr. Leon Laglaize of July 29, 1908, gives a completely erroneous impression of the conditions under which the industry of collecting the plumes is conducted in Venezuela."

ALL THE BIRDS OF BRIGHT PLUMAGE ARE IN DANGER.

The plumes of the egrets and herons form but a fraction, though a significant fraction, of the whole trade. With regard to the thousands of birds whose skins and wings are brought into the mart on allegation of "artificial" or "moulted feathers" can be maintained; no person has dared to invent such a fable.

Efforts, too, may be made to prevent the detail of sales from being made public. It may be argued that birds are catalogued for which there is known to be no market; that the names by which they are catalogued are not the correct names; that certain birds can not be nearing extermination because there are still recesses of forest and swamp which the hunters have not yet penetrated. But unanswerable facts remain.

RARE SPECIES.

The arguments advanced by the trade amount to this: If a very small number of a given species are offered for sale, they come "accidentally." "If," says Mr. Downham.

If rare birds come to the salesrooms from time to time it is because those who killed them, and who would have killed them in any case for sport or food, have sent the skins on the off-chance of their purchase by collectors.

Readers of The Feather Trade may picture the native of New Guinea, or the traveler in Mexico, cooking his blue bird of paradise or his quetzal, and carefully saving the skin to forward to Houndsditch in the hopes of a bid from the Natural History Museum. But Houndsditch, it would seem, does not know them when they come. Mr. Buckland cites an instance of 12 of the rare blue, or Prince Rudolph bird of paradise, being found by him amongst the skins in Cutler Street: "10 birds of paradise, blue, dull," being the catalogue description afforded of female and unfledged male birds. (Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, December, 1909.)

These are the birds, presumably, that come by units. Should they be represented by, say, a couple of hundred in a year of such a rare species as the lyre bird, we are asked to believe that so small a number proves—not that the bird is being extirpated and larger numbers can not be obtained—but that as the trade has secured so few it can not be the plume hunters who are endangering the species.

THE "WASTE MATERIAL" THEORY.

Should, however, some species be represented by thousands or tens of thousands, suggesting to scientific men the shooting out of whole colonies, the upholders of the feather trade argue, with equal facility, that if so many birds are to be had there must be plenty left behind. If it is proved that birds are being recklessly killed in one district, it is held to be a satisfactory answer that there are unexplored wilds where the hunter has not penetrated yet. When American bird lovers passionately denounce the traders who have fished from them their herons and ibises and spoonbills, Mr. Downham, of The Feather Trade, seeks to soothe them with the assurance that he had read in a recent book of the existence of herons and spoonbills in Spain. According to this ingenious spokesman of the trade, it is never, under any circumstances, the trade that is at fault, never the trade which kills. At most it is merely the dog which trots behind and picks up the birds, getting the feathers by way of reward. When man opens up a new land, we are assured, he naturally shoots "all that runs or flies," and the plume hunter follows in his wake in order to utilize "waste material" in making ornaments "which some women insist upon wearing." In the forest and the swamp, and on the remote island, where there is no one to see and to note, in Guiana and Papua and Brazil and the Congo, and the islands of the Pacific, the plume-hunter's ravages are but an economic salvage of waste material.

Could the veriest child credit such absurdities? This, we are to suppose, is why the plume hunter is held at bay by force of arms and by

stringent laws in civilized lands; this is why such reports as the following constantly come from countries where naturalists write of the facts within their own experience.

EVIDENCE FROM SALE ROOM AND CATALOGUE.

Shortly after the importation of plumage prohibition bill had passed through the House of Lords in 1908 the trade stopped detailed advertisements of their sales and ceased to publish any reports on them in the Public Ledger. They now contend that figures from catalogues are misleading, as the same consignment of birds may be offered many times. Humming birds, which continue to appear in crates, have been unsalable, according to Mr. Downham, for 20 years; yet at the sale on February 7, 1911, one firm catalogued no fewer than 20,820 of these birds. In 1905 a different firm put up 12,500. If this is the supply in the market of birds which are not wanted and not used, and have not been wanted for 20 years, it is difficult to imagine the reckless slaughter which must be perpetrated and the numbers that must be killed of birds which are in active demand.

NOT WANTED.

The fact that a particular bird is not wanted for the time being is no proof of its safety. As in the case of the grebe, it may suddenly be again declared "fashionable." It is stated also by Mr. Downham that some birds are brought into the market merely as an experiment. They are killed, not because there is a demand for them, but on the chance that the demand may be created. This again shows the danger in which every species of finely plumaged birds stands until legislation interferes.

Visitors (there are very few, and they are not welcomed) to the Cutler Street warehouse can see for themselves the piles of brilliant bodies of trogons from Guatemala, cocks of the rock from Guiana, toucans, with their wonderful beaks sliced through to form a "handle" for the adjacent breast plumes; orioles, bright-hued finches, tanagers, crowned pigeons from New Guinea, emu skins, wings of sea swallows, hundreds and thousands of quills, and tumbled in among the "various bird skins" which have no names will be found little flycatchers and cuckoos and sober-plumaged bodies that seem to offer no special target for the hunter. Very possibly in this mixed bag many a strange and rare species is "knocked down" without recognition, for plumage dealers are not ornithologists. (Feathers and Facts, pp. 16-25, 27.)

GAME BIRDS AND POULTRY.

The trade dwells a good deal on the use made of game birds and of poultry. This suggests the need of precaution in any legislation. *The Grouse* pigeon of a single land, the *Impeyan* pheasant of the Himalayas, the *Argus* pheasant, the *Chinese* pheasant are included in the milliner's idea of "game." In 1899 the Society for the Protection of Birds in China (Shanghai) memorialized the British Government on the subject of "the great and rapidly increasing destruction at present overtaking the pheasant in China."

The trade to which we refer is that which, originating in the exigencies of fashion, calls for the export of the entire skin of the pheasant, and its ravages, even at its present initial rate, are sufficient to threaten the species with extinction. The necessities of such a trade recognize no "close season." Feathers and skins taken in breeding time are well suited to the requirements of the market. (Celestial Empire (Shanghai), Sept. 11, 1899.)

SHORE BIRDS.

There are included in the *Limicola* several species that are game birds in name only, their bodies being so small that they possess no value whatever for food purposes. Thousands and thousands of these beautiful and graceful creatures have been slaughtered solely for their plumage, their diminutive bodies not being considered of enough value to send to the market. (Report of National Audubon Association, 1906.)

THE WILLOW GROUSE.

In "A Russian Province of the North," by Alexander Platonovich Engelhardt, governor of the Province of Archangel, translated by H. Cooke, His Majesty's consul at Archangel, the author writes of willow grouse ("Koropatki"): "We brought back on the *Nordenskiöld* a cargo of 600 poods, or nearly 10 tons, of these wings. They are exported from Archangel to serve as trimmings for ladies' hats. The white plumage has this special advantage, among others—that it can be dyed any color, and in this way be converted into the feathers of parrots or any other bird, for selling purposes." "The glossy skins of black-throated divers' necks are, also, to my knowledge," says Mr. Harvie-Brown, the well-known ornithologist, "sold in vast quantities at Archangel for trimmings. Is it not shameful that such birds, even if still abundant as 'Koropatki,' should be killed simply for their plumage?"

All these birds were killed in the nesting season for their plumage.

Twenty-two thousand pounds of grouse wings means at least 200,000 game birds killed for their feathers and the bodies thrown away.

Before I come to some items relating more particularly to the destruction of birds in America, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the claim made by the trade in London that the protection of the plumage birds will throw many people out of employment:

THE PLUMAGE IMPORTATION BILL.

A.—THE LABOR QUESTION.

It was the favorite contention of the trade that—

the bill, if passed—the bill pending in the House of Lords—would throw out of employment thousands of British workpeople—

That was in the hearing before the committee of the House of Lords—

without protecting the life of a single bird." (The Feather Trade, p. 119.)

To which statement Mr. Downham adds:

"We have thousands of workmen and workwomen to consider."

BRITISH LABOR.

The question of the thousands of workpeople may be considered first. Fashion has never shown the slightest inclination to consider the case

of workpeople injured in a change of materials or of trimmings. It has not even considered the case of the manufacturers. The fancy feather trade is, however, happily one in which the industrial question is very little involved, as the material gives less labor to the working class than probably any other kind of trimming that could be, and would be, employed in its place. The profit does not go to pay the wages of a large number of hags; it goes to the few firms who conduct the business. This was brought out very clearly in the examination of trade witnesses before the House of Lords committee. It was then shown that of the imported feathers 80 per cent go out of England to be made up in foreign factories; with 80 per cent of the goods English labor has, therefore, nothing to do. The remaining 20 per cent give employment, during a portion of the year only, to young women who are engaged at other times in manipulating ostrich feathers and making artificial flowers. One trade witness said:

"The trade does not go on always; it is mostly in the fall of the year when these birds are employed. In the summer season our firm makes artificial flowers, and other people employ themselves with ostrich feathers."

Should the plumage of wild birds be no longer obtainable, ostrich feathers and poultry feathers will remain; and there can be no doubt that the use of artificial flowers and berries, and of ribbons and fancy ornaments would increase and would give more employment in the labor market than is now given by the importation of wild-bird plumage. Said Lord Avebury, in questioning Messrs. Sciana's representative at the committee:

"Q. 270. You say that the bill would diminish the demand for labor in this country, but as it would replace a certain quantity of feathers which are grown abroad by a certain quantity of articles which are made in this country, clearly it must tend to increase the demand for labor in this country?"

What had Mr. Downham to say about his thousands of workmen and workwomen? He said:

"On the question of labor, there may not be so much difference one way or the other, but I can not admit that it would increase under the bill."

OSPREY AND HORSEHAIR.

To make up the tale of workpeople, the trade now propose to include in the list of those whose employment will be gone the men who handle the goods in the docks and the assistants in the feather departments of drapers' shops. Perhaps there should also be included the purveyors of the horsehair that comes over as top dressing for smuggled bird skins. (See p. 63.) On the other hand might be urged the increased work afforded, not only to the young ladies in the artificial-flower side of retail businesses but the workers in all those factories (in the air) which the trade not long ago swore were engaged in the manufacture of artificial ospreys. If, as a witness for the trade stated to the committee on July 8, 1908, "ospreys" can be made so perfectly from horsehair that no one but an expert can tell the difference, by all means let cases of horsehair be imported, without destroying the underlying strata of bird skins and egret plumes.—(Feathers and Facts, pp. 30, 31, and 32.)

Let us now take a look at the plumage trade and the opposition it has aroused in other countries. Australia, after a long struggle against the bird killers, now prohibits the exportation of plumage birds under heavy penalties.

In November, 1910, a memorial was presented to the British colonial secretary from the British colonies of South Africa and New Zealand and Australia stating, in substance, that the home Government should aid these colonies in their efforts to protect birds by enacting the importation bill which had passed the House of Lords.

It is believed that England will be unable to resist this urgent plea from her colonies any longer and that the House of Commons at its next sitting will concur with the House of Lords and put an end to this inhuman and uncivilized traffic.

At the International Ornithological Conference, held in Berlin in 1910 to consider the necessity of protection for the birds "killed for their plumage," 14 nations were represented, including the United States, England, and Germany.

As I have said, in 1902 the Government of India made the export of skins and plumes from India illegal.

Naturalists and others interested in the matter saw with surprise that in spite of this prohibition the feathers of birds peculiar to the East Indies and of others strongly suspected to come from thence continued to be offered for sale in Mincing Lane.

HOW BIRD FEATHERS COME FROM INDIA.

The explanation of this was furnished by the board of customs to the House of Lords committee in 1908. It then appeared that between December 20, 1907, and February 15, 1908, 23 cases of dead bird skins from India were imported as cow-hair or horsehair; that in March 6,400 further skins were imported, hidden under a layer of horsehair and described as horsehair; that "osprey" feathers from India were sent by parcel post, declared as dress material; that smuggling was also carried on by way of Straits Settlements in order to evade examination by the customs officers. (See Feathers and Facts, p. 63.)

The gentlemen who appeared before the Finance Committee endeavored to excuse their shameful traffic to-day by denying that they deal in egret plumes.

I want to call your attention to what they said when they did deal in egret plumes, and then I want any Member of this body to believe anything they say to-day if he can.

In the publication known as *The Feather Trade*, page 117, it is boldly stated that the claim that the plumage of the egret is taken from the bird when it is alive and the young ones left to starve is false and absurd.

Other statements found in *The Feather Trade* I quote as follows:

It is no doubt true that the egret at one time existed in very large numbers in Florida. The birds exist still in numerous swamps known as the "Everglades," but there had never been any supply of importance from those parts. * * * American commercial development is entirely responsible for the disappearance of the white heron from its old-time haunts; the feather trade is not. (*The Feather Trade*, pp. 40, 102.)

They were not exterminated; they migrated. You might just as well say that because you do not see foxes on Hampstead Heath foxes are exterminated. (Mr. Downham, before the House of Lords committee, 1908.)

The egret * * * thrives to-day in the remote Everglades of Florida and in Southern States. Naturally enough these egrets are not to be encountered in the beaten paths of the United States tourist. (*The Feather Trade*, p. 14.)

There were never many egrets in Florida. You can soon exterminate a small number of birds in a small part of the country. If there were egrets in the Isle of Wight they would soon be exterminated. (Mr. G. K. Dunstall, representing the feather trade before the House of Lords committee, 1908.)

The tale about the birds being shot at breeding time is a fairy myth. (Mr. Weller, before the House of Lords committee, 1908.)

In reply to these statements I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the report of Mr. W. E. D. Scott, member of the American Ornithologists' Union, published in the *Auk* in 1887.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask, for information, where are these aigrets now principally obtained?

Mr. McLEAN. In South America.

Mr. REED. What is the bird from which they are obtained?

Mr. McLEAN. The white heron.

Mr. REED. Is it of any use on earth except for its feathers?

Mr. McLEAN. It devours a great many injurious insects.

Mr. REED. I am asking if it is of any use to man except for the feathers it produces?

Mr. McLEAN. I think there has been a decision by the Supreme Court of Ohio to the effect that the heron is a game bird.

Mr. REED. I wish to know if it is of any value, not whether somebody has passed a law about it.

Mr. McLEAN. It devours injurious insects, and that is largely its value, outside of its beauty.

Mr. REED. Why, the heron is a fish-eating and frog-eating bird, is it not?

Mr. McLEAN. They do feed on fish to some extent.

Mr. REED. If you have a bird that is not of any use except for its feathers, and has no occupation but eating fish which furnish food, just of what value is that bird except for its feathers? What does the Senator think God Almighty made it for, anyway? Certainly a heron is not an ornament.

Mr. McLEAN. The reports of recent investigations show that the heron eats a great many injurious insects, and I think the opinion of naturalists has changed very much in recent years with regard to the economic value of the heron, as I will show later on in my remarks.

Mr. REED. Why should the heron be permitted ruthlessly to destroy the innocent insects and the innocent fish?

Mr. McLEAN. I will leave that question to the Senator to answer for himself. The annual loss to agriculture caused by insects is enormous.

Mr. REED. I really honestly want to know why there should be any sympathy or sentiment about a long-legged, long-beaked, long-necked bird that lives in swamps and eats tadpoles and fish and crawfish and things of that kind; why we should worry ourselves into a frenzy because some lady adorns her hat with one of its feathers, which appears to be the only use it has.

Mr. McLEAN. I have stated to the Senator the use and economic value of the heron, which is admitted now, although it was denied years ago. But the egret is not involved in this proviso. Beyond that, I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that more than 5,000,000 of these birds have been destroyed, millions of them in Florida, all killed in the nesting season, when the young were, say, half grown; and the manner of the destruction of the adult birds for their plumage destroys millions of young birds, which die by slow starvation. Murder has been committed in this trade in our own country. It seems to me it is worth while, if these birds are to be destroyed, that in civilized nations they should be destroyed in a civilized way. If they are useless, let them be killed in a proper way, and not by slow starvation.

Mr. REED. But the point I am getting at is the use of the bird. Now, I know very little about aigrets. I have a faint, protoplasmic notion as to their cost.

Mr. McLEAN. I should hope that might insure the Senator's sympathy with the proposed legislation.

Mr. REED. If the Senator is introducing this bill not to protect the birds but to protect the pocketbooks of the male population of this country he will arouse a great wave of sympathy by which even I might be swept away; but if it is on account of the birds, I wish to ask the Senator if it is not true that the only time they are of any value is at the time the egrets can be obtained, which is the time they are killed? If the young are then left to starve it would seem to me the proper idea would be to establish a foundling asylum for the young, but still to let humanity utilize this bird for the only purpose that evidently the Lord made it for, namely, so that we could get egrets for bonnets for our beautiful ladies.

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator that I think the feathers are worth twice their weight in gold at the present time.

Mr. REED. Then, I insist, if that be true, that we ought not to be prohibited from having the use of them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me for a moment?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Missouri asks of what use they are. The egret is a most beautiful bird. I do not know of what use a painting is except to look at and admire. I feel very sure that we might as well and with equal propriety and esthetic taste look at a beautiful bird and admire it, and that they ought to be permitted to live for that purpose if for no other.

Mr. REED. Why, Mr. President, these birds come from a country where there is nobody to look at them, for the most part. Certainly we in this country can not look at them, and I do not know why we should protect the denizens of distant climes. The Indians of South America have not enough esthetic taste to admire them—nay, more, they have not enough humanity, according to the Senator's statement, to prevent them from slaughtering these birds in what he claims is a cruel and unusual manner.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Connecticut will permit me to say just one word more: The usefulness of these birds in the destruction of insects is beyond computation. This may not be an accurate statement, but I read in a scientific journal not long ago that if the birds of the world were exterminated the human race would go out of existence in a very short time.

Mr. REED. But, Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will pardon me, and then I will not interrupt him further, of what interest is it to the people of the United States to protect birds that kill insects in South America, if they do kill insects? It appears that this bird, if it eats insects at all, does so in such small quantities that it took science a great number of years to determine the fact. Pretty nearly all of us know what a heron is. Every boy that has every tramped through the swamps hunting ducks has been disturbed occasionally by a discordant cry, and the sight of long and ungainly legs, and still more ungainly wings, and the flutter of an awkward bird over the weeds. If he has any use on earth it certainly is not to delight the sense of beauty, for he is about the homeliest combination of feathers and bones and feet and claws that ever was gotten together on this earth. He lives thousands of miles from our country. He lives in the uninhabitable swamps of South America. He is captured down there by the natives, and it appears that he is captured because there is one beautiful thing about him, and only one, and that is this little feather that they call an egret that the women use to adorn their bonnets.

Instead of making these things dearer I am in favor of making them cheaper. I do not know what interest the United States of America has in protecting birds of that kind that are born in swamps thousands of miles away, and that neither delight the sense of beauty nor serve any useful purpose.

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator that the egrets are gone. There are none to-day, except a few which exist in protected heronries. All the wild birds, so to speak, have been exterminated; so the Senator need not give himself any uneasiness over the egret question. If he will listen, I should like to read a description of the manner in which these birds have been destroyed.

Mr. REED. But, Mr. President, if they are gone, if they are dead, if this chapter lies in the dead and buried past, why should we be legislating about it in the living present?

Mr. McLEAN. But we are not. Aigrets are not included in the proviso at all. I am simply calling the attention of the Senate to the way in which the bird trade tried to deceive the

public at a time when they were destroying the egrets. I am showing the Senate how utterly unworthy of belief the plumage traders are by referring to their attempts to deceive the public in the past.

Mr. REED. It is hardly worth while to take the time of the Senate to demonstrate that the man milliner has very little regard for truth and veracity. I think that might be conceded.

Mr. McLEAN. If the other Members of the Senate agree with the opinion expressed by the Senator from Missouri, I shall occupy but very little time on that question; but I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the way in which these birds, which he considers to be of no value, have been exterminated, and that in the face of the fact that the trade has denied any connection whatever with the destruction of these egrets in our own country. It is the character of the plumage trade that the fate of the egret illustrates. No humane man can read it without a shudder.

I quote from the report of W. E. D. Scott, member of the American Ornithologists' Union, published in the Auk.

May 4, 1887: Charlotte Harbor. Only a few years ago bird life so abundant that it would be difficult to exaggerate the numbers. Capt. Baker said that about 60 acres were so covered with white ibis that "it looked from a distance as if a big white sheet had been thrown over the mangroves." Sailing to-day over 40 miles, I did not see a place that was occupied by even a few birds. Postmaster and others all agreed that for the past two years birds had been so persecuted to get their plumage for the northern market that they were practically exterminated. Birds were killed, plumes taken from the back, head, and breast, and carcasses thrown to buzzards (i. e., vultures).

May 8: Macleod Island, great breeding place of reddish egret. Found a huge pile of half-decayed birds lying on the ground, which had been killed a day or two. All of them had the plumes taken, with a patch of skin from the back, and some had the wings cut off. I counted over 200 birds so treated. Within the last few days it had been almost destroyed, hundreds of old birds having been killed and thousands of eggs broken. I do not know of a more horrible and brutal exhibition than that which I witnessed here.

May 12: We found in camp Mr. Frank Johnson, who is a professional bird plumer. Snowy heron, American egret, and reddish egret brought the highest prices, but he killed almost anything that wore feathers. He said he wished there was some law to protect the birds, at least during the breeding time, but added that, as everybody else was pluming, he had made up his mind that he might have his share. He was killing birds and making plumes now for Mr. J. H. Batty, of New York City, who employed many men along the entire Gulf coast from Cedar Keys to Key West particularly for herons, spoonbills, and showy birds. He told me of the enormous breeding places that had formerly been the homes of the birds of this region. Now most of them were entirely deserted and the number still resorted to yearly becoming smaller. "It was easy to find thousands of birds five or six years back where absolutely none now exist." My own observations lead me to agree with this statement. But in fact the destruction must have been greater than can be realized.

May 27: Mr. Frank Higley told me the same story of extermination I had already heard so many times—two large rookeries of herons where we were now anchored, but broken up by plume hunters, and it was impossible to find any breeding or roosting in this vicinity.

May 29: Sarasota. All birds killed off by plume hunters. It is scarcely necessary to draw any conclusions or inferences. This great and growing evil speaks for itself. I have the names and addresses of some 50 dealers in various towns in Florida and the principal cities of the country. Merchants in New York and other centers are buying, every month, the skins and plumes of Florida birds. The price paid for such material, notwithstanding the efforts made to create sympathy for the birds and a feeling against using the feathers for hats and other decorative purposes, is each year becoming higher, showing how great is the demand and how profitable the traffic to these men milliners.

I now quote from Mr. Gilbert Pearson, member of the American Ornithologists' Union:

I visited a large colony of herons on Horse Hummock (central Florida) on April 27, 1888. Several hundred pairs were nesting there at the time. . . . Three years later I visited the heronry, but the scene had changed. Not a heron was visible. The call had come from northern cities for greater quantities of heron plumes for millinery. The plume hunter had discovered the colony, and a few shattered nests were all that was left to tell of the once populous colony. The few surviving tenants, if there were any, had fled in terror to the recesses of wilder swamps. A few miles north of Waldo, in the flat, pine region, our party came one day upon a little swamp where we had been told herons bred in numbers. Upon approaching the place the screams of young birds reached our ears. The cause of this soon became apparent by the buzzing of green flies and the heaps of dead herons festering in the sun, with the back of each bird raw and bleeding. . . . Young herons had been left by scores in the nests to perish from exposure and starvation.

Mr. H. K. Job, State ornithologist of Connecticut, has the following to say in reply to the claim of the plumage trade that the egrets are not injured in the collection of their plumage:

What a spectacle, the dark-green mangrove foliage dotted with blises of dazzling whiteness, "pink curlews" (the local name for the roseate spoonbill), and blue-tinted herons. Wherever I may penetrate in future wanderings I can never hope to see anything to surpass or in some respects to equal that upon which I now gazed. Years ago such sights could be found all over Florida and other Southern States. This is the last pitiful remnant of hosts of innocent, exquisite creatures slaughtered for a brutal, senseless—yes, criminal—millinery folly. Such inaccessible tangles of southern Florida are the last places of refuge, the last ditch in the struggle for existence to which these splendid species have been driven. ("Wild Wings," by H. K. Job, p. 54.)

I reveled in the sights and sounds of this wonderful place, which is probably the largest and perhaps the only large egret rookery in North

America. The only reason that it exists to-day is because it is guarded by armed wardens who will arrest or, if necessary, shoot any person found upon the property with a gun.

That the work of destruction is going on with rapidly one can not fail to realize who has been in Florida. Three years ago these beautiful and spectacular species were to be seen nearly everywhere. In 1903 I had hard work to find a few scattered colonies in the remotest and wildest parts of the State. Mr. F. M. Chapman went there last season and found them all practically annihilated. The same is becoming true even in southern Brazil. ("Wild Wings," by H. K. Job, pp. 143-145.)

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I am in hearty sympathy with the purpose of the Senator, but it strikes me that it is not as much a question of imports here as it is the prevention of the slaughter of birds in our own States.

Mr. McLEAN. I am coming to that.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If the fact be that prohibiting the imports of these feathers is going to increase the slaughter at home under the lax regulations of our own State, I doubt whether the Senator will accomplish the purpose in which he and I both have such intense sympathy.

I appreciate the awful crime of the slaughter of the birds of America. Can we not, under our interstate-commerce power or by some other device within Federal control, make up for what the State lacks in the performance of its duty in the protection of game or song birds and accomplish the result by that means rather than by a mere attempt to prevent the importation? In other words, I much prefer that they should be imported from other countries than killed at home. I am intensely in favor of the protection of bird life, and I shall be found always doing my best through all effective means to accomplish that most humane and beneficial end.

Mr. McLEAN. I shall undertake to show to the Senator before I finish, if he will do me the honor to listen, that the egret is a small item in the matter of bird protection. They have been exterminated by the bird pirates and exist only in heronries which are guarded by wardens with rifles. My purpose in calling the attention of the Senate to the cruel and wanton destruction of the egret is to show how the trade has deceived the public in the past. Of course, what we are interested in, in the first place, is the saving of American birds, but if the Senator will bear in mind that during eight months of the year all our birds of bright plumage go to the islands of the sea, Central America, and South America, and there are the prey of the bird pirates and are killed there and exported to England, France, or Germany and there mounted and returned to this country, he will see possibly that some benefit may arise in preventing the importation of our own birds into this country in that way.

Notwithstanding this overwhelming proof that the plumage birds were all killed in the nesting season and by and for the trade, and for the New York trade until very recently, we find this astonishing statement in the Feather Trade:

I can assure you most solemnly that the trade has no agents who are known or encouraged to poach upon preserves or reservations. That such poaching goes on is undoubted. Men who are working in the virgin lands where wild birds are plentiful will kill what they can, where they can, and when they can, and they will make the best use they can of the plumages, whether there is or is not a market. (Feathers and Facts, p. 63.)

Mr. President, the fate of the egret is the fate of all the birds of bright plumage, and all of them have been found to be of great economic value as destroyers of insect pests.

In the brief of the Trade submitted to the Finance Committee of the Senate we find the following statement:

We, the undersigned, importers and manufacturers of foreign bird plumage, excepting aligrettes, respectfully object to the provision in Schedule N, 357, of the new tariff bill, H. R. 3321.

We deal exclusively in the plumage of birds of foreign nativity, totally dissimilar to any American birds, and, needless to argue, if the aforementioned provision is enacted this industry must come to an end.

The effrontery of this statement, to say nothing of its inaccuracy, will be best understood by calling the attention of the Senate to the facts collected by Mr. James Buckland and printed in his work, The Destruction of Plumage Birds, published in 1909. I use the word "facts" because Mr. Buckland bases his statements upon diplomatic and consular reports, which can not be controverted.

I quote as follows:

VENEZUELA.

THE WHITE HERON.

Thirty years ago there were heronries in Florida which were estimated to contain, severally, about 3,000,000 white herons. At the same period prodigious multitudes of these birds roamed widely over China. But even these vast hordes could not withstand slaughter during the breeding season, and now the white heron is practically exterminated in North America and in the Middle Kingdom.

From the many official returns in my possession showing the extent of the annual slaughter of this bird, I will extract two. They are taken from the Diplomatic and Consular Reports on the Trade and Commerce of Venezuela, and show the quantity of egret plumes exported from Ciudad Bolivar during the years 1895 and 1908, respectively. I quote verbatim from the report for 1895: "The quantity of egret feathers

exported has this year reached the high total of 2,839 kilos. Considering that about 870 birds have to be killed to produce one kilo of the small feathers, or about 215 birds for one kilo of the larger, the destruction of these birds must be very great, and will no doubt affect the production before long." Commenting on these figures, her late Majesty's minister at Caracas said—I again quote from the report—"If, therefore, we take the average, the number of birds killed last year was 1,538,738, but if we take the highest number it was 2,469,930, and even the lowest accounts for the slaughter of 610,385."

Now, let us turn to the consular report for 1908—only five years ago. In this instance the quantity is given in ounces, and from these official figures we learn that the total export of egret plumes last year was 42,986 ounces. It is acknowledged by the trade that it takes, on an average, six birds to yield one ounce of these scapular plumes. If therefore we multiply this number of ounces by six, we will ascertain the number of white herons killed in Venezuela in 1908. The product is 257,916. That is to say, if we take the average mentioned by the British minister in the 1898 report—which I think fair—the effect of 10 years' slaughter was to reduce the production—I use round numbers—from one million and a half to 250,000.

These particular figures can not be considered too gravely. They furnish complete evidence not only of the rapid diminution of the species in Venezuela but also complete evidence—unless effective protection comes in time to save the bird—that what has happened in North America and in China is going to happen in South America, and, for the matter of that, in every country in the universe in which the white heron is found.

THE JABIRU.

The shallow lagoons which are occasionally met with in the great savanna regions of the middle Orinoco district in Venezuela are favorite feeding grounds of the American jabiru, the largest but one of all living storks. Slow and deliberate in its movements, and walking always with military precision, this giant bird is known locally as the "soldier stork." In the country districts of Venezuela one is likely to hear many stories of the part this bird with martial tread has filled in shaping the history of that country. One very good one is in connection with the Venezuelan war for independence, and relates how a body of Spanish soldiers mounted a rise in the savanna they were crossing to be suddenly confronted in the distance with a long line of soldiers in red jackets and white trousers marching toward them with all the precision of veterans. Without waiting for a closer acquaintance the Spaniards turned and fled. They had come upon a flock of jabiru.

Some idea of the size and strength of this bird may be gathered from the fact that the nest, which is a great platform of sticks, built usually in a solitary tree in the midst of a great rolling savanna, contains pieces of wood 4 or 5 feet in length and as large around as a man's wrist. Such a grand bird was not made for vulgar desecration, yet for the last 10 years there has been a growing demand for its wing and tail feathers. In the London plume sales alone there were catalogued last year 28,250 of these quills.

In the Consular Report for 1908 we find that, exclusive of the plumes of the white heron, there were exported from Ciudad Bolivar during that year 10,612 pounds weight of "other feathers and plumage." Five tons, nearly, of feathers shipped from one port in one year? I ask you to ponder on these figures and to reflect what this annual hecatomb of birds darkly yet plainly indicates.

THE WEST INDIES.

The ancient Mexicans looked upon the humming birds as emblems of the soul, as the Greeks did upon the butterfly, and held that the spirits of their warriors who had died in defense of their religion were transformed into these most brilliant of living creatures in the mansion of the sun.

It is a curious thought which is brought out by the fact that centuries later in the world's development the humming bird should be marked out for slaughter more than any other bird. Its destruction in the West Indies has been such that certain species with a restricted habitat are already exterminated, while others are at the point of extermination. In Trinidad, for example, the number of species has been reduced from 18 to 5.

The humming bird is protected by law and by sentiment throughout the Crown colonies of the West Indian division. Yet the mouth of the dealer is filled with laughter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, I do not want to take up the time of the Senate, but I wish to say that when I was a boy there were humming birds all over my part of the country; there must have been 500 varieties of them; and they were of every colored wings that you could imagine, bronze, scarlet, green, blue, and everything else. I do not see a humming bird now twice in a season.

Mr. McLEAN. The reason why is because many of our humming birds go to Cuba for the winter and are there killed in great numbers. I read a report a few years ago stating that some 30,000 humming birds in one shipment were sent from Cuba to Europe to be mounted, and in one auction sale in London I think nearly 2,000 of these birds were sold for 2 cents apiece.

Mr. LANE. Will the Senator allow me to account to the Senator from Mississippi for the dearth of humming birds in his part of the country at this time and in confirmation of what the Senator from Connecticut has been saying? I have here a specimen of one of these American humming birds [exhibiting]. It was mailed to me by some one a number of days ago. It shows the skin of an American humming bird which was killed in Cuba and shipped to Europe and prepared and reshipped and sold in this country for the purpose of decorating hats. I think if the Senator from Mississippi will look at it he will recognize an old friend. The statement which accompanies this specimen is as follows:

This American humming bird was sold at the August auction of the London feather trade in 1912 for 2 cents along with 1,599 others like it at the same price. At the first three of the quarterly London sales of 1912 the following bird skins were sold: 129,168 egrets, 13,598 herons,

20,698 birds of paradise, 41,090 humming birds, 9,464 eagles, condors, etc., and 9,472 other birds, making a total of 223,490.

The Senator will notice in this exhibit which I make that the pennies which originally accompanied it are gone. I have transferred them to my pocket for safekeeping.

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that I am not at all sure his exhibit is an American humming bird. I had one sent to me, but I was so uncertain of it that I did not feel justified in calling the attention of the Senate to it, because it seemed to me that it might be a Brazilian bird.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It may be a Brazilian bird.

Mr. McLEAN. There are a great many varieties, I may say. I saw recently a report of a cloak made of humming-bird skins in Paris and sold for \$10,000, if I remember correctly.

I have here reports with regard to the destruction of the American flamingo on the Bahama Islands, and I quote from the publication "The Destruction of Plumage Birds," by Mr. Buckland:

THE BAHAMA ISLANDS.

THE AMERICAN FLAMINGO.

In December, 1904, Mr. Frank M. Chapman, curator of mammalogy and ornithology in the American Museum of Natural History, published an account of his discovery of a breeding ground of this singular bird in one of the outer Bahama Islands. Unwittingly he did more, as you shall see. I propose reading an extract from his fine piece of descriptive writing:

"Ten minutes wading through shallow water brought us so near the now greatly enlarged pink band that with a glass the birds could be seen unmistakably seated on their conical nests of sand, and with an utterly indescribable feeling of exultation we advanced rapidly to view at short range this wonder of wonders in bird life. At a distance of about 300 yards * * * we first heard the honking note of alarm—a wave of deep sound. Soon the birds began to rise, standing on their nests * * * and waving their black and vermilion wings. As we came a little nearer, in stately fashion the birds began to move, uniformly, like a great body of troops, they stepped slowly forward, black pinions waving and trumpets sounding, and then, when we were still 150 yards away, the leaders sprang into the air. File after file of the winged hosts followed. The very earth seemed to erupt birds, as flaming masses streamed heavenwards. * * * They flew only a short distance to windward, then, swinging with set wings, sailed over us—a rushing, fiery cloud."

One would have supposed that Mr. Chapman's stirring words would have appealed to the higher elements of our nature; yet no sooner had he disclosed the secret paths which led to this red city than the grasping hand of man clawed it in its clutch. At one time it seemed likely that the negroes who were employed in the slaughter would banish the wonder from the earth. As a set-off against the mischief he had innocently done, Mr. Chapman made heroic efforts to save for future generations what is assuredly the pinkest of all the pink pearls of the Bahamas. In the end—and to him the chief merit is due—the impending peril was averted. The ranks of this red cohort, though sadly thinned, now enjoy immunity from attack. The American flamingo has been included in the schedule of wild birds which are protected by law in the Bahama Islands.

THE UNITED STATES.

THE ATLANTIC COAST.

No better instance of the destruction of species for the millinery market can be given than the massacre of the shore birds of the Atlantic coast of the United States. Twenty-five years ago these birds swarmed all down this coast in incredible numbers. To-day all that remains of that extraordinary abundance is a few scattered colonies, rigidly guarded by wardens. The part which we played in this appalling butchery may be measured from the fact that London was the largest buyer of the wings of the gulls and terns which were shot on these breeding grounds. For years the furious slaughter went on unchecked. At length the consequences became visible everywhere. The supply of wings, which at first had seemed inexhaustible, was rapidly approaching the vanishing point. Then, in response to an earnest appeal by bird lovers, the Government of the United States stirred itself to action, and on March 14, 1903, set aside Pelican Island, off the eastern coast of Florida, as a bird reservation, thereby forging the first link in that chain of insular bird sanctuaries which to-day stretches from Maine to Texas.

But to create national breeding grounds for the birds of the Atlantic littoral was one thing, to protect the birds quite another. The agents of the feather dealers were ever cruising in the offing, and no man knew the hour when they would swoop down and raid a sanctuary. So frequent were these depredations it became necessary to provide the wardens with powerful seagoing launches that they might pass swiftly and safely from island to island. This increased facility of surveillance greatly interfered with the business of the raiders, who resented the check put upon their actions, and stories continually drifted across to the mainland and into the office of the Department of the Interior containing accounts of minor assaults and threatened assaults on wardens, but nothing of a very atrocious nature. Then the people of the United States were startled to hear that one of the chances a reservation warden assumed when he entered upon the duties of his office was the risk of being compelled to surrender his life to the depravity of his fellow men.

Oyster Key Reservation, a small island which lies off the coast of Florida, is fringed with mangrove, and in these bushes nested a few egrets which had escaped the general massacre—one of the very few small colonies in which lies the only hope that one day these birds may reestablish themselves in North America. This reservation was under the charge of Guy H. Bradley, a zealous guardian of the feathered wards of the Government.

On July 8, 1905, Bradley heard the discharge of guns on the reservation, and, rowing across, found two raiders shooting the egrets. Alarmed at his approach, the men ran to their boat, and rowed off to the schooner which had brought them to the island. Bradley reentered his skiff and followed. He was in the act of climbing the schooner's side to arrest the offenders when one of them put his rifle to his shoulder and shot him dead.

By a grave miscarriage of justice the murderer was allowed to go free, the grand jury failing to indict him.

Three years passed, in which the resentment of the plume hunters was confined to its former limits of minor assaults and threatened assaults on wardens. Then, on September 15, 1908, L. P. Reeves, warden of the South Carolina reservations, was brutally murdered. He was shot from ambush, just after dark, as he was nearing his home. Two notorious raiders had been threatened by Reeves with arrest, and on the same day as the murder was committed these men had bought buckshot shells at St. George, 7 miles away. Reeves was shot with a full charge of buckshot, both wads and shot being found in the body. The governor offered a reward of \$500 for the capture of the murderers, but the men got away.

Two months later another human sacrifice was offered to woman's deity. On November 30, 1908, Columbus G. McLeod, warden of the bird reservation at the north end of Charlotte Harbor, Fla., was seen alive for the last time. In the patrol boat was discovered his hat with two long gashes in the crown, evidently cut with an ax. In the cuts were bits of hair and blood, and there was also a considerable quantity of blood in the boat. The body was never found, and it is supposed that it was thrown into the water by the murderer and carried out to sea by the tide, which runs very strong in that part of Charlotte Harbor.

From the day when man became man and walked erect he has slain his fellow man for his gold. Now, the plumes of the egret are worth \$8 the ounce—double the value of gold.

THE PACIFIC COAST.

Little more than a decade of years ago there was no more populous waterfowl district in the world than through the lake region of southern Oregon. It was, in fact, the nursery of the immense flocks of migratory waterfowl of the Pacific coast. To-day these shallow bodies of water are almost depopulated. Prof. W. W. Cooke, of the Biological Survey, states in one of the annual reports of the Department of Agriculture, that hundreds of tons of ducks were killed each season merely for their green wing feathers and the bodies thrown away. White herons, swans, geese, pelicans, ibises, and other species too numerous to mention here, were all slaughtered in a like way, and for a like paltry end.

But it is of the destruction of the grebes that I intend to speak particularly. The grebe colonies which were scattered round the lakes were probably the most extensive in the world. It was from here that the feather merchants for years obtained the bulk of the supply of those silvery breast feathers which women were wont, while the supply lasted, to attach to some portion or other of their attire. During the last six or seven years there were from 20 to 30 camps of professional killers and skimmers stationed along the border of Klamath Lake, and the north end of Tule Lake, engaged solely in killing grebes. Wagons visited the camps regularly—about three times a week—to collect the skins. This continued until every grebe which had lived on the northern borders of Tule Lake had been wiped out of existence, and until the great breeding grounds on the southern end of Lower Klamath Lake had been reduced to a few small colonies.

When it had become evident that the feather dealers had no intention of staying their hands while a single grebe remained alive, the Oregon Audubon Society, in the spring of 1908, subscribed \$400 for two capable field naturalists to make a trip to the lake district, and to prepare a statement and an appeal to the General Government asking that some steps be taken to prevent the utter destruction of bird life in this area.

I have space to give one extract only from this report. It refers to the grebes on Lower Klamath Lake. " * * * found but one nest, and saw only an occasional scared bird. Skinned bodies floating here and there told the story of disappearance."

Suffice it to say that when the report reached Washington, Mr. Roosevelt, with his usual admirable promptness and intelligent appreciation of the needs of bird protection, at once came to the rescue, and in August, 1908, set aside Lower Klamath Lake, Harney Lake, and Lake Malheur as bird reservations.

But the dealers, who had been working the field systematically, had not quite exhausted the supply of grebes on Lake Malheur, and they were not going to allow even Executive orders and proclamations to stand in the way of their doing so. Last season (1909) there were 6 indictments against dealers' agents filed in the district attorney's office at Burns for shooting grebes on Lake Malheur Reservation. These indictments cited the killing of 400 grebes by one hunter and 1,000 by a second hunter. While these indictments were being made a number of sacks belonging to a third hunter and containing the skins of 800 grebes were seized at the express office at Burns. Unfortunately the poachers heard in advance that indictments were to be made and escaped to California.

I will conclude these few remarks on what was once one of the most extensive breeding grounds in the world with an extract from the monthly report ending May 31, 1909, of the State warden of Lake Malheur Reservation: "Very few grebes are nesting on the reserve this year—mute testimony of the inroads of previous market hunting. A few gulls and terns are nesting, but very few."

THE ISLANDS OF THE NORTH PACIFIC.

The extent to which the destruction of birds is carried in the North Pacific Ocean may be gauged by a few extracts from the report of William Alanson Bryan, United States special inspector of birds and animals. The report is dated October 31, 1904, and is addressed "To the Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States." In this official communication Mr. Bryan states:

"During the past few years I have visited practically all of the low coral islands in the North Pacific, and have been appalled at the destruction of the birds on these islands by Japanese plume hunters, who made a business of visiting not only the bird islands of their own possessions but those of the United States as well, and killing birds by the hundreds of thousands. On Marcus Island a party had been at work for six years. In that short time they had wiped out of existence one of the largest albatross colonies in these waters. So complete was their work of destruction that during the year of my visit they had only secured 13 specimens of the albatross. While there I estimated that they had 40,000 tern skins ready for shipment, which was the second boatload to be shipped that year. * * * Midway Island at the time of my visit was covered with great heaps of albatross carcasses which a crew of poachers had left to rot on the ground after the quill feathers had been pulled out of each bird."

The report then deals with the depredations on Lisiansky Island, which is one of the outlying Hawaiian islets, and is a wonderful center of ocean bird life. For the purpose of brevity I will present this por-

tion of Mr. Bryan's report in my own words: In 1904 a Tokyo firm fitted out a schooner at Yokohama and dispatched her to this island, the object of the expedition being the collection of plumage for the millinery markets of Europe. The staff of killers, skimmers, and taxidermists on board numbered 87. The schooner duly arrived at her destination, when the party landed and commenced at once to kill the birds. A few weeks later their presence on the island was observed by the captain of a ship engaged in the guano trade, who reported the matter to the chief authorities at Honolulu. The U. S. S. *Thetis*, of the Revenue Service, was at once dispatched to stop these unlawful operations. She arrived at Lisiansky Island to find that the raiders had already collected 335 cases of plumage, representing the skins and feathers of 300,000 birds.

After relating this incident, Mr. Bryan takes, in order, all the low islands of the chain and shows how each is similarly scourged.

The raids led to an interchange of views on the subject between Washington and Tokyo. It is only fair to Japan to say that she at once issued an order warning ship captains not to carry men who were engaged in this piracy. But the raids continued. Then, in reply to further protests from Washington, the Japanese minister for foreign affairs presented his compliments to his excellency the American minister, and, while assuring him of Japan's sympathy and cooperation in the matter of the bird laws of the United States, had the honor to inform him that the class of men engaged in plume collecting was composed largely of lawless marauders. The Japanese minister for foreign affairs knew what he was talking about. In 1908 the skins of about 50,000 terns from these islands came under the hammer in Mincing Lane. I have not yet completed the details of the London plume sales for this year, but I notice that terns from the North Pacific continue to be a feature of the catalogues.

On December 17, 1904, the nominee of a syndicate of Europeans addressed a letter to the governor of Honolulu, in which he made the following proposal: He was to be granted a lease of a certain number of the North Pacific islands—which he specified and which are the principal breeding grounds of such albatrosses and terns as are left to these waters—on these conditions: He would agree for 10 years to plant each year not less than 1,000 coconut trees. After expatiating on the benefits which would accrue to the country and to the people from the change of a bird reservation into a coconut plantation, the nominee went on to say that he would agree to protect the birds, but asked for the privilege of killing annually such numbers as would not, in his opinion, affect the continuance of the several species. Finally he agreed to pay to the Territory 10 per cent of the net realizations from the sale of the bird skins.

This disingenuous attempt to secure to the millinery interest a concession which would have meant the annihilation within four or five years of almost every bird in the north Pacific Ocean was exposed by Mr. William Dutcher and vetoed by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. President, the truth of the matter is, the plumage hunters slaughtered the American egret until they were stopped by armed wardens, but not until they had committed all the crimes in the code from theft to murder.

It further appears that the plumage trade has done all that it could do to exterminate every other American bird of bright plumage from the humming bird to the albatross. It is no thanks to the feather trade, and very little thanks to the Federal Government, that there is a plumage bird now living in the United States.

The claim that the trade does not deal in American birds is true only so far as it may be unable to buy American birds. All of our birds—humming birds, orioles, scarlet tanagers, indigo birds, plover—in fact, any bird of bright plumage, when it leaves the United States in the autumn spends seven or eight months far away from the protection of our State or Federal laws, the prey of the bird killers. In the London auction rooms we find the following birds in the market and sold by the thousands: Humming birds, 2 cents each; tanagers, 9 cents each; and orioles, any one of which is worth a hundred dollars to the American farmer, 6 cents each. Is it probable that a trade which in the past has never been caught telling the truth will to-day limit its shameful occupation to the purchase of European orioles and tanagers only? The fact of the matter is that this trade is world-wide. It buys every bird that is brought to it and which it can resell at a profit.

It has left behind it a trail of savage cruelty and civilized greed and cunning, and nothing whatever to commend it except the blood money it has collected from ignorant women. I say ignorant women, Mr. President, because no woman worthy of the name will encourage this trade once she understands her responsibility for it.

It is said that protests against the House proviso have been received from Germany. Let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact that for many years Germany, by imperial act, has strictly prohibited the killing of the useful and beautiful birds within her own borders. Upon what ground and with what grace do the German merchants ask us to find a market for their contraband goods?

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the German Nation was the pioneer in the matter of effective bird protection. In 1868 the German farmers and foresters, after their twenty-sixth general assembly, appealed to the Austrian and Hungarian foreign minister, begging him to use his influence to persuade both Austria and Hungary to join them in their efforts to protect the birds valuable to agriculture and forestry.

The Germans from their earliest history have been alive to the value of birds, and in later years have been most persistent in their determination to protect their own birds. The Emperor

Frederick II was known as the "Crown Fowler"—1215—and wrote a book on birds which is said to have been remarkable in its day. In 1777 Lippe Detwold issued a decree protecting birds. In Sax-Coburg birds were protected by decree in 1809. In 1837 the Grand Duke of Hesse forbade the slaughter and sale of birds useful to agriculture, and provided for the protection of nests and broods.

It was upon the initiative of the German farmers and foresters that the first ornithological congresses were held, which finally resulted in united action on the part of the nations of Europe.

In 1908 11 European nations—Austria, Germany, Belgium, Spain, France, Greece, Monaco, Portugal, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, and Luxemburg—ratified a joint treaty for the protection of birds.

As long as the German Government punishes with heavy penalties the killing of her own birds, I do not believe that the United States trespasses upon international comity or courtesy when she declines to buy contraband birds or their plumage.

It is said that this proviso will encourage the destruction of American birds; that the demands of the trade will be so strong when the importations are shut out that it will compel a raid upon American birds.

Mr. President, Dr. Field, the Massachusetts game commissioner, testified before the congressional committee that he had within a few years prosecuted over 75 milliners for selling the plumage of native birds in Massachusetts, and in every instance the defendant claimed that he could not tell the native from the foreign plumage when it was received from the dealers. It was found in the trial of these cases that all manner of beautiful American birds were killed and their plumage sent to Berlin or London or Paris, and there mounted and returned to this country as foreign plumage. How easy, under these circumstances, for the traders who appeared before the Finance Committee to swear that they never deal in American birds. And how clear it is that only by the strictest guard over our imports can we prevent the cunning dealers from stealing our birds and selling them back to us as foreign birds.

It is contended by the trade that the enactment of this law will throw those now engaged in it out of employment—the same claim that was made and abandoned in London because entirely without foundation.

The savages who do the killing will hardly excite our sympathy. As for the milliners, there is ample proof that the trade will be quickly diverted to artificial lines, which will multiply manifold the labor now required to mount the natural plumes.

I have in my office a few samples of what is now being done in the line of artificial plumes made of the feathers of domestic fowls, also a few samples illustrating what can be done with the ostrich plumes, which I shall be glad to show to any Senator who feels interested.

It was declared by the trade when New York passed its law prohibiting the sale of imported plumage resembling that of native birds that 20,000 people would be thrown out of employment. The trade was forced to admit later on that nothing of the kind had happened.

Right here I want to call attention to an amendment which was offered as a compromise and which permits the importation of the plumage from game and noxious, or pestiferous birds. I will say with regard to this amendment that it opens the door so wide that the trade will go on precisely as before. The only way to protect our birds is to stop the sale of their plumage as such. As long as you permit the sale of plumage the birds will be killed for their feathers alone.

The plea that the feathers of game birds should be admitted is easily answered. Game birds are and will be imported with their feathers on, and this law will in no way affect the trade in game birds. Where the plumage of game birds is imported, it is taken in the nesting season and the bodies of the birds are thrown away.

The tons of ptarmigan wings recently imported from Russia meant the slaughter of tens of thousands of game birds in the spring for their wings only.

It is very clear to those who meet this question fairly that the way to protect the birds is to stop the sale of their plumage. As long as birds' feathers are worth their weight in gold the birds who happen to produce them will be hunted to the uttermost parts of the earth. Nearly all of the civilized nations prohibit the killing of plumage and insectivorous birds. But there is still a vast field unguarded, where the bird pirate can ply his trade, and will ply his trade as long as the highly civilized nations furnish a market for his victims. If the people of the civilized nations have at last been aroused to the great economic value of the birds of the world and the need of immediate and strict protection to prevent their extermination they must stop the trade in plumage, except such as can

be provided by the ostrich and domesticated birds, or their efforts to protect will be in vain.

Now, let us look at the precise situation in so far as it affects the United States to-day. Less than a year ago Congress by law prohibited the killing of the migratory song and insectivorous birds at any and all seasons of the year, and the plumage birds are included in this list. Under the spirit and letter of this law we are particeps criminis. We are receiving stolen goods if we permit the trade in contraband plumage to continue.

Again, and still more to the point, many of the States of the Union—New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Louisiana, Ohio, Colorado, Oregon, Washington, South Dakota, Missouri, and Maryland—all prohibit the sale of the plumage of native birds, and in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania the plumage of all birds resembling the native birds is outlawed and can not be sold. I assume that this situation will appeal strongly to the Senators who represent States where plumage is now contraband. What is there in this trade that should tempt any Senator to encourage and invite violations of the laws of his own State? It was found in Massachusetts that the trade at once took advantage of the opportunity to sell there great quantities of native plumage slightly manipulated to resemble the plumage of similar birds killed in foreign countries.

Again, Mr. President, this Senate passed a resolution at this very session inviting the President to negotiate conventions with foreign nations for the protection of birds. Not our birds; not game birds; not migratory birds; not song or insectivorous or plumage birds; but birds, the avi fauna of the world.

The adoption of that resolution by this Senate committed this Senate to secure, if possible, an intelligent world purpose and agreement to save the useful birds whenever and wherever they need saving. The President of the United States and the Secretary of State have both assured me that they will give their best endeavor to this request of the Senate, as they are both in hearty sympathy with its purpose.

The House of Representatives has come to the aid of the Senate by passing the wise and timely proviso which is now under discussion. I may be pardoned for insisting that the Senate can not now honorably or wisely decline to follow where it has already pointed the way by solemn resolution. How can we appeal to other nations to save our birds if we now right-about face and deliberately legalize the killing of their birds by protecting the market of the bird destroyers?

The trade now suggests that a commission be appointed to take this whole matter into consideration in order that some wise compromise and concert of action may be reached. For 30 years this shameful and cruel traffic has perpetuated itself by fraud and subterfuge and crime in the guise of compromise, always asking for more time, always keeping its neck out of the halter by playing the caprice and greed of one nation over and against the caprice and greed of other nations, always protesting its innocence and always found guilty when tried. I hope, sir, that its day in this court is over and that it will be told to divert its activities into respectable channels. It always asks for more time—it has already had too much time. One or two years more means destruction for the birds, and one or two more years of anxiety and suspense and expense for the friends of the birds. This fight has been a voluntary one, and it has been a long fight and most discouraging at times. Since I have been brought in contact with those who have conducted it I have been deeply impressed with their courage and unselfish devotion to their cause.

I can not close this feeble and incomplete appeal to the Senate in their behalf without expressing my belief that the people of this country are under great and lasting obligation to the naturalists who have at last succeeded in bringing public opinion to their support. The ornithologists are enthusiasts; they are as fearless and suspicious as crusaders. Their experience with lawmakers for 50 years has made them so. If the birds are saved, it will be due to the ornithologists and Audubon societies of this country who have founded the indifferent legislator night and day until he has finally opened his eyes to a duty which has been fearfully neglected.

If any Senator will read the recent publications of Dr. Hornaday or Dr. Forbush, two of the great living authorities upon birds and their value to agriculture and the way these birds have been treated by the trade, he will get some idea of the service the bird lovers have rendered to society. I am informed that both of these men appeared before the Finance Committee or sent briefs to that committee for their consideration.

When the migratory-bird bill was under consideration last year Dr. Hornaday sent to each Senator a copy of his latest work, *Our Vanishing Wild Life*. If any Senator desires to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about this matter, I advise him to read this book.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McLEAN. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut if he has read an article sent out by this same gentleman in reference to the Finance Committee and the subcommittee of that committee? I want to say for myself that, if he is no more truthful in his other publications than he was in that, the article was so utterly false, I would not care to read anything he wrote.

Mr. McLEAN. I was not aware that the doctor had made false statements to the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Not to the committee, but he issued a circular that was utterly false.

Mr. McLEAN. If so the doctor was misinformed. He is an enthusiast, as I have said.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that is true.

Mr. McLEAN. They are zealous men, these ornithologists; they have fought for the birds for many years; and they have had very little encouragement from lawmakers. Now they think they see victory for their cause, and they do not take this action kindly. The Senate of the United States, after having solemnly requested the President to negotiate conventions with other nations for the protection of useful birds, should be consistent and not right about face in the manner now threatened.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will yield to me for just a moment with reference to this matter, I desire to state that that was no excuse for sending out such a publication. I only want to say with reference to it, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment, that I believe that the Senator is right, that the doctor is really such an enthusiast on this subject that his zeal led him to act without proper reflection. I really believe his purposes were good, although his statements about the subcommittee were so inexcusable that, if we were disposed to take offense, we certainly would have been justified in doing so.

Mr. McLEAN. I hope the Senator will be as considerate as possible, for I am quite sure that the doctor would not intentionally make a misstatement. He is intensely in earnest in this matter and justly suspicious of the plumage trade.

Mr. Pearson, secretary of the National Association of Audubon Societies, appeared before the Committee on Finance. Others who are deeply interested in this subject are Mr. Henry Oldys, the well-known ornithologist and lecturer; Mr. Joseph Grinnell, of the California Academy of Sciences; Mr. Casper Whitney, editor of the Outdoor World; Mr. Warren H. Miller, editor of Field and Stream; Mr. Walter Stone, president of the Pennsylvania Audubon Society; Mr. John H. Wallace, commissioner of game and fish of the State of Alabama and a loyal friend of the ornithologists; Mr. Ernest Napier, president of the New Jersey State Game Commission; Mr. W. P. Taylor, ornithologist of Berkeley, Cal.; May Riley Smith, chairman bird protection committee of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; Katherine H. Stuart, chairman bird department Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs; Mr. Albert H. Pratt, president of the John Burroughs Nature Club; Mr. William F. Bade, president of the California Associated Societies for the Conservation of Wild Life.

One might continue this list indefinitely. There is hardly a town or village in the country that does not have its Audubon society preaching the gospel of bird conservation, all due to the untiring zeal of the ornithologists who, after years of conscientious and increasing appeal, have lifted the insectivorous birds to their true position in the economies of nature.

My interest in this matter arose from my observation of the rapid decrease in the game birds of this country, and it was in my study of the game birds and my desire to save them that I found the real source and strength of the bird-protection movement. The game clubs sound well, but they are organized to kill as well as protect. The Audubon societies are organized to save. The ornithologists have at last rallied the people of this country to their support, and my hope is that the Congress of the United States, having once taken up their cause, will continue steadfast. Let us stop the killing now, and if, as the trade claims, the birds will increase in such numbers as to be a burden we can, when that time comes, appoint a commission to look into the matter, and, if they are to be killed, let it be done by some other method than slow starvation in the nesting season.

When the migratory-bird bill was under consideration I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that all of the civilized nations are now alive to the great economic value of the insectivorous birds, and it is now well known that the birds which are

killed for their plumage are counted among those which are valuable to agriculture.

I have also endeavored to impress upon the Senate the fact that for humanitarian reasons the cruel and inhuman methods of the bird destroyers should be stopped at once. I have not touched personally upon the ethics involved in this question, but it is now and always has been my belief that sentiment has done more for civilization than money, and when the money is tainted, as that in the plumage trade is tainted, with unspeakable cruelty if not crime, I am sure every Member of this great body will find excuses if not admiration and approval for the sentiment which cries out against this butchery and the fashion which sustains it. And, furthermore, these considerations are all outside the intense pleasure and profit many people find in the companionship and study of birds. Mr. President, I could vote to save the birds for their beauty alone. It may be a weakness, sir, but when the birds fail to come to my door in the spring you can have the door and the spring, too, for neither of them will interest me. It may be thought by some that the subject is a trivial one and that it ought not to be interjected into the United States Senate when so many matters of vital importance are pressing for consideration. My excuses for pleading the cause of the birds are two. First, I want their case tried and justice done to them for their own sake; second, I want the birds saved before we as a great people learn by experience that the birds are more vital to our comfort and happiness than we are to theirs.

I sincerely hope that my friends upon the other side of this Chamber will not insist upon making this a party question. They will find little support for the proposition that the salvation of the Democratic Party calls for the destruction of the birds.

We have been called a commercial people by our neighbors across the water; we have been told a great many times that our high ideals are easily lowered in the presence of easy money or real estate. We are quite sure that our neighbors have been overjealous and overzealous in their criticisms of American culture and motive, but if now with our eyes open we deliver the useful and beautiful birds to the slaughter, we do it for the pieces of silver we are offered in exchange for their feathers.

I sincerely hope that this public and complete surrender to the commercial instinct will not be recorded in this bill, and if it is I shall be glad to see the Republican Party publicly recorded against it.

Mr. O'GORMAN. May I ask the Senator from Connecticut a question?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I do not want to anticipate his suggestion, but I desire to ask what amendment is the Senator inclined to offer to the bill as reported by the Senate committee?

Mr. McLEAN. I will say to the Senator from New York that my amendment simply provides for the restoration of the House proviso.

Mr. O'GORMAN. As to that I am in hearty accord with the Senator from Connecticut. I am in entire sympathy with the views to which he has given expression. I exceedingly regretted that the Finance Committee did not see the wisdom of adhering to the provision as proposed by the House, and I expect, when this provision comes up for discussion in the Senate, that there will be no substantial opposition to the provision being re-committed to the Finance Committee, with the hope that further reflection will induce that committee to adhere to the provisions found in the House bill.

Mr. McLEAN. I am very glad to hear that announcement from the Senator from New York.

I desire to print in the RECORD a letter written to the Washington Star, quoting Sir Harry H. Johnston, who has had many experiences in Africa. I read this letter, as it bears very strongly upon the proposition that this is an international question and that the heron is not as bad as he has been painted by the Senator from Missouri:

[From the Washington Star.]

HARMLESS WILD BIRDS OF GREAT USE TO MAN—ENGLISH WRITER ARGUES FOR PRESERVATION OF FOES TO TSETSE FLIES.

[Foreign correspondence of the Star.]

LONDON, May 19, 1913.

Sir Harry H. Johnston has written a letter to the Times on the preservation of rare, useful, beautiful, and harmless wild birds. He said it is the duty and almost the obligation of Governments to deal with this subject intelligently and with a definite purpose—

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. I merely desire to indorse the statement made by the Senator in relation to what has happened on the Pacific coast, and particularly in Oregon, as to our game birds, and what is happening to other birds which are being destroyed for their plumage, which is used for millinery purposes. Where formerly water fowl were to be seen in countless thousands they are now becoming scarce, and I have no doubt that if remedial measures are not adopted every bird will be destroyed.

In the old days we had the elk. We had them in large herds; but they were killed for the pitiful sum of \$1 apiece, which was derived from the sale of their hides. It is wrong; we are making a mistake in this respect, I am quite sure, and we ought to correct it before we go further.

I wish, Mr. President, to indorse the proposed amendment of the Senator from Connecticut and to say that my sympathy is with him in the effort which he is making for the protection of birds.

Mr. McLEAN. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I was reading a letter from Africa to the Washington Star. There is a great continent, which we hope will be returned to civilization, a place where white men can live in comfort and prosperity.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not know what the committee may do if this paragraph is recommitted to it. There have been some expressions of dissatisfaction with the action of the committee in striking out a part of the proviso in the House bill; and, in deference to that dissatisfaction, it was the purpose of the committee, when this paragraph was reached, to ask that it be sent back to the committee, in order that there might be further consideration and discussion; but what will be done about it of course I can not say, and I do not think any Senator can now say. That, however, was not the purpose for which I rose.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds to another topic—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Several items have already been sent back to the committee. I will ask the Senator from North Carolina if it is the purpose of the chairman to call the full committee together to consider those items? I think on an item like this the full committee certainly ought to be called together.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the matters that have been or may be sent back to the committee will probably be dealt with as the bill was originally dealt with.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the Senator who has charge of this bill that they will be sent back to the caucus, for they have been reported after caucus action.

Mr. SIMMONS. Undoubtedly, after the committee has acted, following out the policy we have pursued with reference to the bill, the Democratic caucus would act upon the items. I do not think that anyone can speak now for either the committee or the caucus; but, as I said, that was not the purpose for which I rose.

Mr. McLEAN. I am very glad to hear the announcement of the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. It has been our purpose, in deference, as I said, to some little expressions of dissatisfaction, to pass this paragraph when it should be reached, and have it go back to the committee for further consideration.

Mr. McLEAN. I will express the hope that the committee and the caucus, upon reconsidering this matter, will vote to restore the House provision.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to ask that the paragraph relating to feathers may not be acted upon until it is regularly reached, because when it is regularly reached I wish to present some of the reasons which, I think, justified the Finance Committee in its action. In doing so I wish to say that I shall do so from the standpoint of one just as much interested as anyone else in birds and their protection, and with a record, perhaps, of almost as much accomplishment in that line so far as my own State is concerned, as anyone has accomplished in his State.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. McLEAN. If the Senator from North Carolina will allow me, I had about finished when I called the attention of the Senate to this communication.

Mr. SIMMONS. There are some questions that I wish to ask the Senator, but, of course, if the Senator prefers I will wait.

Mr. McLEAN. No; if they refer to this matter, I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. They do refer to this matter.

The Senator has discussed egrets. Of course the Senator knows that the importation of egrets is prohibited under the bill. Then, I understand the Senator's main purpose is to protect American migratory birds?

Mr. McLEAN. It is an important purpose, but my interest in this matter is largely brought about by the fact that the United States must take this step of protecting our own migratory birds as far as we can by preventing these importations, thus paving the way for consistent action in our endeavor to secure the cooperation of the nations of the world in an international agreement for the protection of all useful birds.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not desire to enter into any discussion of the matter. I simply wished to get the Senator's point of view, and to ascertain whether the Senator wished us to undertake to protect all foreign birds without any reference to whether or not they are American migratory birds.

Mr. McLEAN. Certainly, if they are useful birds. If they are useful wild birds or plumage birds, I certainly should insist that it is our duty, having taken this step, to set foreign nations an example which we hope they will follow, in London and in Berlin and in Paris.

Mr. SIMMONS. Has the Senator in mind any law passed by any foreign Government undertaking to protect the birds of other countries? I know the Senator has referred to some negotiations and conventions, but has any foreign Government ever passed a law along that line?

Mr. McLEAN. Australia prohibits the exportation of plumage; India does the same thing; and all the English colonies have memorialized the British Government to prohibit the introduction into London of their plumage birds.

Mr. SIMMONS. But has any Government up to this time passed any law prohibiting the importation of the plumage of foreign birds?

Mr. McLEAN. I do not know that any nation has gone further than the English Government. A bill to that effect has passed the House of Lords—

Mr. SIMMONS. Would it be possible for the Senator—not to-day, but for the use of the committee later—to specify the American migratory birds that he thinks we ought to protect?

Mr. McLEAN. I think it would be very difficult, owing to the experience which has been had in the States of the Union where the plumage is now contraband, as in Massachusetts. By slight manipulation of the native birds they have been made to resemble foreign birds, and have been sent back here and put into the trade; and when prosecutions have been brought the milliners have invariably set up the defense that they supposed they were buying foreign birds. The only way to protect a bird is to prevent its slaughter, and you can not do that unless you cut off the market for the plumage.

To return to Africa and Sir Harry Johnson's letter. Mr. Johnson goes on to state his experience in Africa, which I think is very interesting at this time, because it points to the real importance of this subject. As an international duty, I am proud of the fact that the United States, after years of neglect, has finally taken a position where she may be a leader in this great service to humanity as well as to the birds. Mr. Johnson continues:

Among the hundred and one reasons I have adduced for the protection of birds, especially in the Tropics, was the fact that many species in Africa fed on the tsetse flies. They are, in fact, in common with certain reptiles, the only effective enemies of the tsetse fly. I had noticed personally, from 1883 onward, a continually increasing destruction of certain birds in west and west-central Africa which feed on the tsetse fly among other items in their diet.

NOTED AS COINCIDENCE.

Coincidentally during this period there has seemed to be a decided increase of tsetse flies in the coast regions of west Africa and in the Kongo Basin. At the same time trypanosomatosus diseases, conveyed by this genus (glossina), have greatly extended their ravages. It is permissible to assume therefore, as several French writers on west Africa have assumed, and as the late George Grenfell was beginning to assume in his diaries, that there is some connection between the destruction of white herons, rollers, bee eaters, shrikes, guinea fowl—the guinea fowl scratch up the larvae of the tsetse and probably eat them in that stage—and other birds, and the apparent increase of the tsetse in uninhabited places and the consequent spread of sleeping sickness.

SACRIFICE IS HARMFUL.

I have personally noted the eating of tsetse flies by almost all the species mentioned. I do not pretend that they do not devour all other flies that come in their way, but I do say that the destruction of the egrets and smaller herons, of rollers, bee eaters, etc., does remove one of the few means we have of checking the increase of the tsetse.

Of course the tsetse question is only one among a hundred other reasons for putting a stop forever to the destruction of birds merely or mainly for the ignoble purpose of using their plumage for the adornment of the human person. There are quite sufficient avenues along which the legitimate trade in feathers can be fed without bringing one lovely, remarkable, or valuable bird species to extinction or the verge of extinction.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope now we may go on with the reading of the bill.

I desire to say to the Senate that I hope as far as possible hereafter we will let the paragraphs and the discussion accord with one another. If a paragraph is away at the back of the bill, it seems to me it would be better to let it wait until we get to it, and meanwhile it may dispose of itself, as possibly may be the case with this particular paragraph.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have so much genuine regard for the Senator from Connecticut, who has just spoken, that I am almost forced to respect his opinions. But it seems to me we are following a curious line of reasoning upon this bill. It is rather strange that the business of the country should be halted at this time to give serious consideration to the prohibition of the importation of feathers because of an overstrained, not to say maudlin, sympathy for birds born and reared thousands of miles from our coast.

The business of the United States awaits the passage of this tariff bill. All men, whether they be protectionists, free traders, or tariff reformers, understand that the sooner this great question is settled and the country knows exactly what the tariff rates are to be the sooner can business adjust itself to the new conditions and proceed to do business. There is not a wholesale merchant in the United States, not an importer of goods, not a manufacturer, not a producer of raw materials who does not find the market more or less interfered with because of the fact that this bill necessarily involves changes in commercial transactions. Until the bill is passed trade can not go on in its usual and vigorous course.

With that situation before us we stop to discuss the question of humming birds and herons. We pause here solemnly to dilate upon fanciful outrages alleged to be, or to have been at some time, perpetrated upon feathered tribes that are born and die in remote places of the earth far from the haunts of civilization and the eyes of men, and thousands of miles from our shores.

Mr. President, one day I passed along the street of a city and witnessed a sight I shall never forget. Standing in the display window of a business building then occupied by some kind of a cheap show was a tiny girl, not more than 5 or 6 years of age—a beautiful child, with great, innocent eyes and delicate features just then distorted by mingled loathing and fear. Around this baby's neck were wrapped five or six venomous rattlesnakes in direct contact with her white, tender, velvety skin. The child was there to attract the attention of the passers-by to the show. I saw a policeman gaze at the fearful spectacle in stolid indifference, and then I saw him suddenly rush into the street and arrest a man for driving a horse that was drawing a load that appeared to be a trifle heavy. Nobody paid any attention to the child. No one lifted a hand to protect the baby from the infamous outrage perpetrated upon its innocence and its helplessness by the heartless cupidity of some monster who held it in his power.

I have often thought of that scene and of how well it characterizes our course throughout this life. Indifference to human kind and tender solicitude for the brute creation is not new to our boasted civilization. Why, in ancient Egypt the crocodile was protected by the sacred and secular law. So highly was it regarded that in their ignorance and superstition mothers would ravish suckling babes from their breasts and feed them to the scaly monster. There were men then who could lift up their voices and speak for the denizens of the river in accents so tender as to not only evoke sympathy for the crocodile but also to convince the mother that it was a religious duty to sacrifice her offspring to satisfy its appetite for flesh. These same teachers entirely forgot the mother in her ignorance and the child in its helplessness.

In Turkey they have a system of protecting animals. Cats and dogs are sacred in Turkey. From the time they come into the world blind and filling the air with annoying mewings and whinnings they are under the protection not only of the State but of the church. No man dare lift a foot to kick a mangy cur from his house over in Turkey. The dog and the cat are alike immune from harm. But over in Turkey they make slaves of their women. Over in Turkey they perpetrate inhuman outrages upon human beings. Over in Turkey they make charnel houses and slaughter pens in which the men and women God Almighty made are sent to ignominious and cruel death.

Sir, I have heard this "bird discussion" going on from time to time in the Senate for the past six months, and have seen the business of the country halted. I have witnessed the immense interest that can be created over birds. I have more than once wondered why we do not stop sometimes to talk about the tens of thousands of people in this country who live along the edge of want; why we do not stop sometimes to devise legislation

that will protect the pauper child from the horrible conditions in which it is reared; why we do not take a little time away from the songster of the field to think of the songster of the cradle; why we do not pause to contemplate the starving mother who bends over her famishing babe; why we do not give some thought to the children now being reared in ignorance and misery to lives of vice and crime.

Mr. President, I think we would be performing a higher task for our country if we were considering laws for the protection of human beings than we are in discussing legislation for the protection of birds. But since that question is thrust in here, and we are called upon to discuss it, I desire to say, first, that there is a very practical side to this question. We can not tell just how much revenue is to be derived from the feathers of the particular birds referred to in the amendment now being debated, but there was last year derived from feathers, either dressed or undressed, \$1,820,000. It is proposed to abolish that tax, which is a tax upon luxury, and impose it upon industry. It is proposed to wipe out that tax, which is a tax upon luxury pure and simple, and to put it upon the necessities of life. It is proposed to take that tax from those who can afford to pay it and impose equivalent burdens, which, in large measure, must fall upon those who are already staggering beneath too great a load.

There is not a woman who wears an alget upon her bonnet, there is not a woman who buys an imported feather, but is buying something she could do without. Imported feathers are not necessities, they are luxuries. The proposition is to transfer a tax of \$1,820,000 from luxuries and put it upon necessities.

When you come to that proposition, I have more sympathy with the human beings who must pay the \$1,820,000 upon their necessities than I have for the long-legged, ungainly, useless, and altogether homely bird from which algetts are obtained.

Of course we can work up a lot of maudlin sympathy in talking about the wrongs and outrages of birds. We can picture the mother bird hovering over her nest, with her fledglings there looking up to her for food, we can depict the cruel monster who comes along and ravishes the bird of its life, and leaves the poor, innocent offspring to die, and we can get ourselves into a very frenzy of sympathy for the birds. But, Mr. President, that kind of sympathetic twaddle need not be limited to birds. There is not a single animal in all this world you can not create sympathy for by the same kind of argument. Witness the domestic calf. The mother cow has been taught to look to her master for friendly protection. She comes confidently into the corral at night; she generously yields him her milk for the sustenance of himself and his family; she brings forth a little innocent calf, that plays and gambols and looks at him from the unsuspecting depths of mild eyes; that licks his hand and rubs its head against him; that follows him about in complete reliance and calf-like friendship. One day the monster man seizes the confiding, helpless creature, beats out its brains with a bludgeon, cuts its throat with a cruel knife, and with bloody hands tears the skin from the quivering flesh, cooks the meat, and with cannibal ferocity devours it and feeds it to his children.

Thus, we can easily work ourselves into a frenzy over the common barn-yard calf. Why, sir, I can make a speech upon the wrongs of a slaughtered calf that will appear a classic in comparison with the panegyric which has just been delivered upon the awkward, ungainly, long-legged swamp birds of South America from which we get algetts.

Thus, we may rave over the calf and count his wrongs and fill our eyes with sympathetic drops, but just the same we continue to order our veal chops and breakfast on calf's liver.

However, some one replies, the calf is used for food, and therefore its slaughter is justifiable. Mr. President, that may be all right for us, but how about the calf? When a calf is led out to slaughter the knowledge that it will soon fill a human stomach can not assuage its dying agonies. If that knowledge can rob death of its terrors, I might reply with equal force that the swamp herons' afflictions are doubtless solaced by the thought that it is only a miserable, homely creature, of no use on earth except for one feather, and that its departing agonies must be alleviated by the knowledge that that feather will soon go to glorify and adorn my lady's bonnet.

If it is wrong to kill animals for one purpose it is for another. If it is wicked to kill them to put them on our backs it is equally reprehensible to kill them to put them into our stomachs. But if they may justly be killed when they serve a useful purpose, if that is what God made them for when he created the earth and the fullness thereof, then the animal must give way to the necessities and delights of man.

If you are not going to adopt that theory, Mr. President, we have no right to kill a single animal except in self-defense; neither have we the right to enslave an animal. If we have

the right to kill an animal for meat we have an equal right to kill a bird for its skin or its feathers. It is all a part of the same harsh philosophy of terrestrial life. Man stands at the apex of the pyramid and all beneath him must contribute to his welfare and comfort. It may be hard on the animal, but it is the economy of nature established by God Almighty.

Mr. President, let us see: Here is a thing of beauty. That which is beautiful is of utility, for it contributes to the delights of living, to elegance, refinement, and the cultivation of the artistic nature of the race. I do not know that I can specially describe the beauty of an aigret or the beauty of any plume upon a woman's hat, but I do know that the women understand what pleases the eye, and that they have chosen these articles of adornment through all the ages, since and before civilization brought reformers and sentimentalists. I take it feathers contribute to the satisfaction of the ladies. It follows, of course, that they must add to the pleasure of the men. So here are these birds, from which the aigrets are procured, that are hatched and live and die in the almost inaccessible swamps of South America, and we are told that it is wicked to kill them for their feathers. But the same gentlemen declare it is all right to kill the wild duck for its meat. I say that sort of logic is mere rot. If it is right to kill the birds for one purpose it is for the other.

I come now to the question of protecting birds, because birds have a utility. I believe birds in our own country do have a real value. Their gay plumage and their sweet song contribute to the delights of the eye and to the pleasures of the ear, besides they serve another utilitarian end, namely, the destruction of insects. But when you say to the people of the United States, you can not buy the feathers of birds that were born in foreign lands, that were brought here from the heart of Africa or South America, or the remote islands of the sea, you thus say to the people of this country who are handling feathers, you must slaughter and kill the home birds. And they will slaughter and kill the home birds. Just as the tariff upon lumber tended to the destruction of the American forests and the preservation of the Canadian forests, so will this tend to the destruction of the American bird and the preservation of the foreign bird.

Why, sir, as you approach the Canadian line you find on this side of it a waste of land covered with stumpage and undergrowth and on the other side the towering pines lifting their magnificent heads in grandeur and sublimity toward the skies, as they did before the sound of the ax resounded through the primeval forest. But on this side of the line the monarchs of the woods are gone. Why? Because we taxed the lumber when it came in, and thus we put a premium on the destruction of our own forests.

The amendment that is proposed to the bill ought to be entitled "An amendment to encourage the slaughter of American birds and to protect the birds of foreign countries." I am opposed to that kind of legislation. I insist that this revenue which now springs from ornaments, from luxuries that people can do without and that only those people pay who can afford to pay—that this revenue which comes chiefly from the pockets of the wealthy and is laid absolutely upon a luxury shall continue to be laid upon that luxury and not be taken from it and put upon the blankets of poor people—upon the woolen cloths and cotton fabrics that are worn by the man and the woman who toil from morning until night, who grind in the mills of labor and who walk in the paths of adversity.

I have nothing against the bird, but I have more interest in human beings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The reading of the bill will proceed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I should like to return to paragraph 212 to offer an amendment. It will take probably just a few minutes to dispose of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that paragraph was passed upon, and it is out of order to go back to it now.

Mr. JONES. I understand that we can go back to any paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; but I hope Senators will keep trace of the bill and that when we get through with a paragraph we will be through with it hereafter. I shall not make any point against it.

Mr. WARREN. Was the paragraph passed over?

Mr. JONES. Not paragraph 212.

Mr. WARREN. I think it was the general understanding, and it was consented to on the other side, that we could turn back to any paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The understanding was that the amendments of the committee should be considered when we reached a paragraph, and then we would consider any other amend-

ment, and unless it was passed over by unanimous consent it could not be returned to as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WARREN. That was not the understanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I am not making the point. I merely hope that hereafter Senators will keep up with the paragraphs as we get to them, and then if a Senator wants to have a paragraph passed over we shall pursue the course we have been pursuing and have it passed over. Then all Senators will know that it will be returned to.

Mr. WARREN. I agree with the Senator that we should pursue that course as far as possible, but I remember the reply of the chairman of the committee, when I interrogated him, that these items could be turned back to at any time before finishing the bill. Such a course is necessary, and must be followed as agreed upon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the chairman of the committee to agree with the Senator that any paragraph could be returned to later, but that that question was to be submitted to the Senate when we got to it, before we passed from the consideration of the paragraph.

Mr. JONES. I have the understanding that the Senator from Wyoming has expressed. I did not desire to take up the time of the Senate yesterday in delaying the bill to ask that the paragraph be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the paragraph.

The Secretary read the paragraph, as follows:

212. Hops, 16 cents per pound; hop extract and lupulin, 50 per cent ad valorem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the paragraph insert the following proviso:

Provided, That all hops when imported shall have the name of the packer or grower and, beneath the same, the name of the country and the particular hop district wherein the hops were grown and the year of production of the hops indelibly stamped or branded upon each container, and in a place that shall not be covered thereafter, except by outside containers marked the same as the inside container: *Provided further*, That all hop extract and lupulin when imported shall have the name of the packer or grower and, beneath the same, the name of the country and particular hop district wherein were grown the hops from which the hop extract or lupulin were extracted and the year of production of the hops indelibly stamped or branded upon each container, and in a place that shall not be covered thereafter, except by outside containers marked the same as the inside containers.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to congratulate the committee upon retaining a sufficient amount of duty upon this one agricultural product and to call attention to the fact that the amendment which I have proposed does not propose an increase of the duty, but proposes marks and designations for the prevention of fraud.

The amendment I have proposed is very similar to other provisions in the bill of which the committee have approved. For instance, in paragraph 123, in reference to "table, butcher, carving, cooks", and so forth, knives," they have provided that these articles when imported shall have the name of the maker or purchaser, and beneath the same the name of the country of origin indelibly stamped or branded thereon. Then, in paragraph 163, there is a similar provision in reference to watches and watch movements. The similar provision is, I suppose, for the purpose of assuring the purchaser that he is getting what he desires and what he thinks he is getting. There is a great deal of complaint with reference to hops that are imported being mixed and being sold for what they are not.

I have a letter from the Agricultural Department in reference to the matter. I wrote to them and asked them for any information they could give me with regard to the necessity for an amendment of this character, because it had been called to my attention that hops were mixed and imported here as a certain kind of hops when they were not that sort of hops. There are different kinds of hops and of different quality. Some are more desirable than others, and they command a higher price and are sought after by those who use them for certain purposes.

The Agricultural Department writes me that—

The Bureau of Chemistry has conducted work to determine whether the food and drugs act might be invoked to prevent certain frauds in connection with imported hops, particularly from England and Germany, mixed with Bohemian, and sent to this country as Bohemian hops.

There seems to be no method at present that can be relied upon to distinguish one kind of hops from another. Some of the work done would probably enable the department to ultimately distinguish chemically between different varieties. Just as soon as this work has advanced to that stage the department can proceed against such hops under the food and drugs act.

So about the only recourse we have, and that may not, of course, accomplish all the purpose desired, is to require those importing hops to mark them so as to give us an opportunity,

if they are not what we are getting or what we desire, to see whether there has been actual fraud. That is the very purpose of this amendment. The department says:

It is the opinion of our experts that the passage of the proposed legislation would only partially remedy the abuses, its chief value being that it would draw the attention of European governments to the frauds which they are perpetrating.

Mr. President, that is the sole purpose of this amendment. It is to protect those who need in their business imported hops from being defrauded as far as we can go. According to the department it is impossible for them to determine by chemical means or means at their command in every instance whether fraud has been practiced or not. So it is in the hope of protecting them somewhat that this amendment is offered. As I said, it is very much in line with other provisions of the bill, and I hope that the Senator in charge of the bill will not be disposed to object to this amendment, which is really to protect our own people from fraud, which it is admitted is perpetrated by those sending hops into this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, contrary to our general course in this bill this is a paragraph which we left undisturbed. The rate which is carried now is the rate which was carried under the Payne-Aldrich bill. We left it undisturbed because hops enter mainly into the manufacture of beer and malt liquors and things of that sort not necessary to life. We thought it was a very good article to get revenue on.

Whatever may be the purpose in the mind of the Senator from Washington—and I know, of course, it is just what he states—the effect of the amendment proposed by him would be to hamper still further the importation of hops without adding a dollar of revenue for the Government and in proportion as we hamper by taxation regulations the importation it might possibly decrease the revenue.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. JONES. How could it hamper the importation of hops to require them simply to bring to our country and sell to our people what our people are asking for?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are some provisions of this sort applied to cutlery, to keep a man from selling cutlery of one make as the cutlery of another and deceiving the purchaser. Here is a hop and there is a hop, and the Agricultural Department says, by the Senator's own admission, that it can not tell them apart, they are so nearly the same. You want to brand them so that somebody will know them apart. The Bureau of Chemistry can not tell them apart, and the purchaser does not, by looking at and feeling them when buying, know them apart, if I understand the situation.

Mr. JONES. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that hops grown in a certain locality are known to be of a particular quality; that is, they have a peculiarity due to them. The purpose of the amendment is to have the hops grown in that locality so marked, just as cutlery that is made abroad and imported is marked as coming from a certain place. That is the sole purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is to keep them from putting off inferior cutlery as the make of a house that makes better cutlery.

Mr. JONES. So is this to prevent—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know there is a fancy price for Bohemian hops, because Bohemia makes an excellent beer, and there is an idea that Bohemian hops will make it; but the Senator has just confessed that the Agricultural Department itself says it can not chemically or otherwise tell the difference between Bohemian and other hops, and if it can not they must be wonderfully alike.

Mr. JONES. Their failure to do it is all the more reason why we should make this safeguard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary read the next paragraph, as follows:

218. Straw, 50 cents per ton.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to offer an amendment to paragraph 218.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 60, line 3, strike out the words "50 cents" and insert "\$1," so as to make the paragraph read:

218. Straw, \$1 per ton.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, this is not a large industry in this country, but I believe that we ought to protect those who live along the border line whether it is to the north or to the south.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Speak for the North, not to the South, at any rate. If the Senator from North Dakota will pardon me a

moment, last night we read paragraph 217 and adopted the Senate committee amendment to it, and had an understanding that certain further amendments to that paragraph would be introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] this morning. If we could dispose of his amendments first, then we would come to the succeeding paragraph. I think that would be a more orderly way of proceeding.

Mr. GRONNA. I shall take only a moment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. GRONNA. I simply want to state that the Canadian rate per ton on straw is \$2 per ton. The present rate is \$1.50 per ton, the same as was the Dingley rate. The Wilson rate was 15 per cent ad valorem. There is some business transaction in straw. The imports for 1912 were 10,268 tons, valued at \$56,890, with a revenue of \$15,401.86. We exported 1,030 tons, with a value of \$11,559. There were sold by farmers in 1909 537,699 tons. The amount received was \$3,189,424.

I shall not ask for a roll call on my amendment, but simply for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in paragraph 217, on page 59, line 19, I move to strike out the words "canary seed, one-half cent per pound."

These seed are on the free list in paragraph 668 under the present law. There were imported in the year 1912, 4,704,625 pounds. The value of it was a little over 2 cents per pound. That is the importation value. Even in the Wilson law canary seed was on the free list. It has always been on the free list, and I can not see why it should be taxed now one-half cent per pound.

Mr. SIMMONS. What are canary seed used for?

Mr. SMOOT. They are mostly used for seed for canary birds and also for an extract.

I move to strike out those words, and if carried, I shall then move that canary seed be put on the free list in its proper place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 217, page 60, line 19, strike out the words:

Canary seed, one-half cent per pound.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. On the same line of the same paragraph I move to strike out "caraway seed, 1 cent per pound."

Caraway seed to-day is on the free list in paragraph 668 of the present law. There were imported in the year 1912, 3,616,481 pounds. The value of it is nearly 5 cents a pound. The imposition of 1½ cents per pound is 20 per cent ad valorem on its present valuation. Caraway seed has always been on the free list, even under the Wilson law. It is used in cooking mostly and in the flavoring of food. It is used by the common people of the country. I can not see why this duty should be placed upon that seed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there are several of these articles placed upon the dutiable list that hitherto have been on the free list. The Senator was wrong in saying that caraway seed had always been on the free list. It was taxed 30 per cent ad valorem under the Dingley tariff.

Mr. SMOOT. That is only a certain class of caraway seed, and that went before the board of appraisers, and it was afterwards decided that it was wrong.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Payne tariff law had a part of it at 30 per cent and a part free. The Dingley tariff law had 30 per cent.

I want to explain why we took this course as to these several articles, and then I shall ask for a vote. Both caraway seed and anise seed are taxed here and both have always been free. Both plainly enter into the class of luxuries. Neither one of them forms any part of a necessity of life. Anise seed and caraway seed are put into little cakes and things of that sort. It is very nice and very sweet, but we did not see why the consumers of cakes with caraway and anise seed in them should not pay revenue to support the Government of the United States. We thought that men could dispense with even caraway-seed cake and anise-seed cake, if they wanted to do so, without any great detriment to their physical constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to move an amendment in line 20, striking out the words "anise seed, 2 cents per pound."

Anise seed to-day is free under paragraph 668. Of course the statement made by the Senator from Mississippi covers anise

seed as well as caraway seed, with one exception. A great deal of anise seed is used for oil and goes into the commercial life of the country. It goes into the hospitals and into the medicine chests of the people of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah, on page 59, line 20, to strike out the words "Anise seed, 2 cents per pound." [Putting the question.] The yeas seem to have it.

Mr. BURTON. The bill imposes a duty of 37 per cent upon an article which has heretofore been free. I ask for the yeas and nays upon the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANE (when Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's name was called). I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is unavoidably absent, and that he is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. McCUMBER's name was called). I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family. He is paired with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS]. I wish this announcement to stand on all votes for the day.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I have a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. In the absence of that Senator, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SHIELDS. I wish to announce the pair of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]. The senior Senator from Tennessee is necessarily absent from the Senate to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]; the Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON]; and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Brady	Cummins	Lodge	Smoot
Brandeggee	Dillingham	McLean	Sutherland
Bristow	Gallinger	Norris	Townsend
Burton	Gronna	Page	Warren
Carlon	Jones	Perkins	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Poindexter	
Crawford	La Follette	Sherman	

NAYS—37.

Ashurst	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Swanson
Bryan	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Myers	Shafroth	Thompson
Fletcher	O'Gorman	Sheppard	Tillman
Hollis	Overman	Shields	Vardaman
Hughes	Owen	Shively	Walsh
James	Fittman	Simmons	Williams
Johnson	Pomerene	Smith, Ariz.	
Lane	Ransdell	Smith, Ga.	
Lewis	Reed	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—32.

Bacon	Colt	Kern	Root
Bankhead	Culberson	Lea	Smith, Md.
Borah	du Pont	Lippitt	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Fall	McCumber	Stephenson
Burleigh	Goff	Nelson	Sterling
Chamberlain	Gore	Newlands	Stone
Chilton	Hitchcock	Oliver	Thornton
Clapp	Jackson	Penrose	Works

So Mr. SMOOT's amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read as follows:

220. Vegetables in their natural state, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem.

221. Fish, except shellfish, by whatever name known, packed in oil or in oil and other substances, in bottles, jars, kegs, tin boxes, or cans,

20 per cent ad valorem; all other fish, except shellfish, in tin packages, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; caviar and other preserved roe of fish, 30 per cent ad valorem; fish, skinned or boned, $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to let paragraph 221 go over for a few moments only. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has been obliged to go to the State Department and will return in a short time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I promised the Senator from Massachusetts, who had to go to the State Department, to let the paragraph go over, meanwhile giving him an opportunity to return to the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over. The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of paragraph 223, which is as follows:

223. Figs, 2 cents per pound; plums, prune, and prunelles, 1 cent per pound; raisins and other dried grapes, 2 cents per pound; dates, 1 cent per pound; currants, Zante or other, 2 cents per pound; olives, 15 cents per gallon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] asked me to get consent to recur to paragraph 223 when he returned to the Chamber, as he desires to offer an amendment to it. I ask that the paragraph be now passed over for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of paragraph 225, which is as follows:

225. Lemons, limes, oranges, grapefruit, shaddocks, and pomelos in packages of a capacity of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubic feet or less, 18 cents per package; in packages of capacity exceeding $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubic feet and not exceeding $2\frac{1}{2}$ cubic feet, 35 cents per package; in packages exceeding $2\frac{1}{2}$ and not exceeding 5 cubic feet, 70 cents per package; in packages exceeding 5 cubic feet or in bulk, $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, paragraph 225 is incorrectly printed. It ought to be printed:

Lemons, limes, oranges, grapefruit, shaddocks, and pomelos, $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 cent per pound.

Of course I am forced to offer an amendment to print it in that shape. I move, then, in behalf of the committee, that that paragraph be amended so as to read:

Lemons, limes, oranges, grapefruit, shaddocks, and pomelos, $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 cent per pound.

I move that substitute for the paragraph as it reads; in other words, the proposition is to strike out all the language about packages, capacity, and so forth.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to call the Senator's attention to that. As the caucus print did not have those words in it, I wondered why they were put into the bill as we have it before us.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is a mere mistake.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The committee had it one way at one time and another way at another time. That explains the fact that it was printed differently at different times.

Mr. WARREN. Does that change the rate at all?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In my opinion, it slightly raises it, but the Senator from Florida and other Senators contend that it keeps it precisely as it was. I think the practical effect will be to raise it slightly at the end of the classifications, but very slightly.

Mr. WARREN. The intention, then, is not to change the rate, but to make it more intelligible or more easily applied?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It fixes the rate at one-half of 1 cent a pound. I have a letter here from Mr. UNDERWOOD, in which he says:

My dear John—

It is addressed to me—

Your favor of the 25th instant in reference to paragraph 277—

Which it was then of the House bill—

reached me to-day. The Ways and Means Committee changed the rate of duty from so much a pound—

Which it was in the Payne-Aldrich bill—

to the cubic contents of the package for administrative reasons solely. We believed that the old method of levying this tax on the cubic contents of the package was more satisfactory than the pound rate. Our intention was to levy a tax of one-half a cent a pound on lemons and oranges, and from the information we have received on the subject I think that you will find that this is carried out substantially in our bill.

Sincerely, yours,

O. W. UNDERWOOD.

So that this is in essence a mere administrative change back to the pound method of levying the tax.

Mr. GALLINGER. Do I understand the Senator from Mississippi to say that it does not change the rate in the existing law?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; it does that. But it cuts the rate as in the House bill 50 per cent upon everything except lemons,

and 62½ per cent on lemons below the rates of the Payne-Aldrich bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then what the Senator said was that it did not change the rate of the House bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It does not essentially change the rate of the House bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, of course if those words were left in the paragraph it would decrease the rate of one-half of 1 cent a pound. A duty of 18 cents on 45 pounds of lemons would be equivalent to four-tenths of 1 cent per pound; a duty of 35 cents on 90 pounds of lemons, the amount in a 2½ cubic foot box, would be equivalent to thirty-eight one-hundredths of a cent a pound; so that if this amendment is agreed to—

Mr. WILLIAMS. As it passed the House—

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senate agrees to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi, there will be an increase on lemons, limes, oranges, grapefruit, and so forth, over the rates as reported to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On certain classifications of them.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that is what I say. I am calling attention to those classifications. There will be an increase if this amendment be adopted.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, what provision is made for the administrative features mentioned by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee with regard to the weight of the container or package? Suppose the lemons weigh a hundred pounds and the package used weighs 20 pounds, how is the weight to be ascertained?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The weight has been ascertained hitherto by taking the lemons out and weighing them. I was much astonished to have some testimony before the subcommittee to that effect. It struck me as the most curious and absurd thing that I had ever heard of any intelligent administrators of any law doing. It seems to me that they could have made a calculation of the weight of the boxes and deducted it without going through all that troublesome course. That, it seemed to our committee, subjected the Government now and then to a charge for fruit that was in the process of weighing, emptying, and so forth, destroyed or injured, and on which the Government could not collect the tax, which it would not be subjected to in the package. The intention of the House committee was to make a package rate which would amount to one-half of 1 cent per pound upon all these fruits, and Mr. UNDERWOOD, in his letter, says that he thinks if I would go through it all I would find that they substantially did that to reduce the rate to one-half of 1 cent per pound. Of course the Senator readily understands that all jumping duties vary. When you get to a certain class, as a matter of fact, one end of that class bears one rate and another end bears another rate; so that this rate, when you reduce it to the pound rate, is a method of levying the tax at approximately the same pound rate per package rate. It does, as the Senator from Utah says it does, raise the duty somewhat upon the ends of the classification, but the administrative purpose which the House leader had in his mind was that it was much easier to count boxes than it was to weigh the fruit.

Mr. BURTON. But how can the weight of these packages be estimated unless you enforce a custom, which seems to have been somewhat in vogue, of taking the fruit out of the package and separating it entirely, thereby compelling a repacking?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have been informed that if the lemons were all imported from the same country, the boxes would substantially weigh the same, but lemons imported from one country may come in boxes made out of thick, heavy wood, while those imported from another country may come in boxes as light as cottonwood, and very thin. There are different methods of packing in different countries. Messina lemons are packed in very rough boxes that weigh more than is necessary. So in administering the law the customs department were in the habit of weighing the lemons themselves independently of the containers.

Perhaps, after a long course of time, if they were to fix a tare, as they do on cotton, for example, when it is sent to Liverpool—an agreed tare to be deducted from every bale of cotton for bagging and ties—it would have the desired effect—and I do not see why the administrators do not do it—of making everybody try to put his lemons in a box that would come as nearly to the agreed tare as possible or below it; but they have not hitherto adopted that means of administering the law. It seems to me that their method of doing it has been very awkward and expensive to the revenue.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the reason that has not been done in the past, in my opinion, is that wherever a part of the fruit has rotted or became worthless an allow-

ance has been made, wherever a pound rate has been imposed, for the amount of fruit in that condition. That, of course, was held, as the Senator knows, in the case of *Harris v. United States*.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In connection with a case concerning grapes in packages it was decided by the courts that they had a right to do the same thing.

Mr. SMOOT. Absolutely; and of course it will hereafter apply to lemons, oranges, or any other kind of fruit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I inquire if this paragraph has been completed?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I had an agreement with the Senator from Massachusetts to recur to the fish paragraph.

Mr. LODGE. I am much obliged to the Senator for passing it over. I am now ready to go on with that paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the paragraph with the committee amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 60, paragraph 221, line 9, after the word "cans," it is proposed to strike out "20" and insert "25," so as to make the paragraph read:

221. Fish, except shellfish, by whatever name known, packed in oil or in oil and other substances, in bottles, jars, kegs, tin boxes, or cans, 25 per cent ad valorem; all other fish, except shellfish, in tin packages, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; caviar and other preserved roe of fish, 30 per cent ad valorem; fish, skinned or boned, 3 of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a plea for a great industry which by the provisions of this bill is injured in all its parts, while that portion of the industry in which my State is particularly interested is menaced with total destruction.

It has always seemed strange to me that it should be the custom to place the fish paragraph in the middle of the agricultural schedule; but there is this to be said, Mr. President, that the fisherman and the farmer, although the crops which they gather are very different, have had much the same treatment at the hands of the Government. Neither the fisherman nor the farmer has ever received a high protection in any law that has been passed, although, as I shall presently show, the fisheries have been the care of the Government from the beginning.

In every attempt at reciprocity the fisherman and the farmer have been those who have been sacrificed. Sometimes it has been the fisherman alone; sometimes, as in the last attempt, the fisherman and the farmer together; so that they have received a similarity of treatment, they have been companions in misfortune, even if there is no likeness between their respective employments.

The fisheries of which I wish particularly to speak are those known as the northeastern fisheries, carried on upon the Great Banks and in the waters of New Foundland. The fisheries of the Great Banks are the oldest and the most historic industry connected with the American Continent. Fishermen from England and from France were on the banks fishing for nearly a century before a single white settlement had been established in the territory now known as the United States. Those fisheries were, of course, continued, and they became a principal source of wealth to the Colonies.

The salted fish gathered by the New England fishermen were shipped to the West Indies and to the southern colonies, where they were very largely used.

The fishing industry was the basis of our commerce in colonial days. How important it was and how much was thought of it at that time is shown by the fact John Adams considered it one of the greatest triumphs of his life that he had been able, in the treaty of Paris, to save the northeastern fisheries and secure for us the privileges on the New Foundland coast, which substantially we enjoy to-day. So great a pride did he feel in it that he had a seal ring engraved on which he put the Latin motto, "*Piscemur venemur ut olim*"—"We shall fish and hunt as of yore"—and his son, John Quincy Adams, I believe, used that same ring with the same motto when the treaty of Ghent was signed.

The fisheries were regarded by all Americans in those days as a matter of great importance. From the time of the famous report on fisheries, prepared by Mr. Jefferson when he was Secretary of State, onward especial care was given to the fisheries. Although the protection afforded them by the Government was of a moderate kind, it was the belief of all the public men of that day that the fisheries deserved the fostering care of the Government, wholly apart from the question of protection to an industry. Of course, at that time there was a consideration

which to-day, with our enormous population, is no longer so serious, which was that the fisheries were the nursery of the seamen who manned the ships of the American Navy.

In the tariff of 1789 salt fish were given a duty of 50 cents per quintal; mackerel, 75 cents per bushel. In 1816, which was a Democratic tariff, carried through under the leadership of Mr. Calhoun, the duty on salt fish was a dollar per quintal, or about 1 cent per pound; and on mackerel \$1.50 per bushel, or about three-fourths of a cent a pound. The average was about the same as the present rate, so far as the specific duty to-day is concerned, but as the price was lower in those days, the ad valorem rate was higher. In 1842 mackerel and herring each paid 1½ cents per pound, other fish in barrels 1 cent per pound, while all other fish paid 20 per cent ad valorem.

Those duties have remained, except during periods of reciprocity, substantially unchanged down to the present time. It is now proposed to put all fresh and all smoked and dried fish on the free list. This is not a reduction; it is the complete removal of the duties. I now ask the Senate to consider the conditions of the industry thus severely treated, for they are, I venture to say, different from those of any other industry in the country.

It costs no more to bring a fare of fish from the Great Banks or from the treaty waters to Boston or to New York in a Canadian fishing smack than it does in one that sails from Gloucester or Provincetown. Therefore no freight protection is possible. I next ask you to consider the conditions under which they have to compete with the fishermen of Canada and Newfoundland.

The fishermen of the United States are required by law to build their vessels in the United States. It costs more to build a vessel here. Apart from the labor, lumber is much cheaper in Canada. A Gloucester fishing vessel costing \$15,500 was duplicated in every particular in Lunenburg for \$9,400. Our people are obliged to build their vessels here. More than that, they are compelled by law to buy their outfits here. They can not buy their nets, their cordage, their sails, their hooks anywhere but in this country. All the outfit of a fishing vessel, under the law, must be bought in the United States. On many of those articles they necessarily pay a tariff duty.

With these burdens they start to confront their competitors. They are handicapped to this extent by the greater cost imposed upon them by law. I shall not go into the question of labor costs for the case is so strong that the comparison is needless. The President, in his message, said he wanted a fair field and open competition. We will assume, then, that the labor cost in the actual work of fishing is the same. The fishing fleet of Canada receive from their Government every year \$160,000 in bounties, paid to them in cash, the interest, or part of the interest, upon the Halifax award. In addition to that the Dominion Government pays one-third of the cost of the storehouses, the ice houses, or cold-storage buildings, where the fish is stored and preserved.

I quote from the Canadian Annual Review for 1911:

During 1910-11, \$332,300 was spent by the Dominion on fish-breeding establishments. And the usual \$160,000 of fishing bounty was paid in the Atlantic Provinces and Quebec—a total, since 1882, of \$4,580,204.

Mr. President, of course the money I spoke of as additional to bounty was not that spent in fish breeding; but the Canadian Government aids its fisheries by paying one-third of the cost of the construction of cold-storage plants, and makes rebates on the transportation of their products on all the railroads.

By this bill our fishermen will be forced to meet this bounty-fed competition, while being compelled at the same time to use more expensive outfits and more expensive vessels, unaided and without any protection whatever. Under such conditions it is utterly impossible that our fishermen should continue to fish on the Great Banks or in the treaty waters.

If I may call your attention to the views taken of this matter on the other side of the line, the Halifax Chronicle, speaking of this bill, says:

It will place the fishermen, particularly of the western shore of Nova Scotia, in practical control of the New England market for fresh fish without any abandonment of national rights of any reciprocal concession of fishing privileges to Americans in Canadian waters.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, was that written at the time when the House bill was before the newspaper writer, or the Senate bill?

Mr. LODGE. It relates to the House bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senate bill raised this rate of duty 5 per cent from the House bill.

Mr. LODGE. I am not speaking of the fish that are left dutiable. I am speaking of the fish you put on the free list. The duty in paragraph 221, of which I am not speaking, covers the sardine industry of Maine, where the fish is packed in oil, and that is substantially all it does cover. It takes care

of the sardines which are packed in oil on the coast of Maine. They will not be injured. I am very glad that that portion of the fishing industry is to be preserved.

The Herald, of St. Johns, Newfoundland, a Province which was excluded from the benefits proposed by the Canadian reciprocity compact, could not refrain from saying as follows, although the provincial newspapers were urged to say nothing about it before this bill, so precious to them, became a law:

It would be difficult to imagine any change calculated to prove of greater value to this country than the grant of free entry of our fish into the United States. For years we have been seeking this, and vainly; we have been offering substantial concessions therefor in the past, and now it has come to us without our having to give any corresponding concession whatsoever.

The article goes on to say:

The advantage which will follow from this transformation of the industry will be enormous and will grow as the years advance, and opportunities for us in Newfoundland are such as never existed before.

That is what they expect from the removal of these duties. Why, Mr. President, for years Newfoundland and the maritime Provinces have been making every kind of offer, offering all sorts of concessions, in order to get an entry to our market and remove our duties. This bill will turn over the entire fishing industry of the Northeast—that is, the Great Banks and the treaty waters—to the Canadian and Newfoundland vessels. There is no escape from it. It will also turn over to them a large part of the packing industry that is not covered by paragraph 221—the smoked, dried, salted, pickled, or frozen fish. It will probably carry the packing industry with it in the end; but the fish that are now packed and preserved in the factories at Gloucester and elsewhere will be brought there henceforth in Canadian vessels.

Mr. President, I am unable to understand the theory upon which this industry is to be destroyed. We imported last year 5,000,000 pounds of fish from the Provinces. We produced 15,000,000 pounds ourselves. The duty is a large revenue raiser as it now stands. There has been no serious advance in the price of fish. The average profit on fish I will say here is less than the duty—less than three-fourths of a cent per pound. In seven years the price of fish has advanced only from 6 cents a pound to 6.2 cents a pound. It has advanced only two-tenths of a cent a pound in seven years, and that small advance is due undoubtedly to the increasing diminution of the catch.

This industry has another peculiar feature. The fishermen employed are paid directly from the catch. In the case of almost all the vessels that go out of Gloucester the fishermen on the vessel have one-half the profits and the captain and the owners have the other half. Therefore the pay of the men, like the profits of the captain and the owners, depends on the success of the voyage. Sometimes their profits are very large, if they have a good catch; sometimes the fares are very small, and the wages and profits go down. At its best it is not a very profitable industry.

But the men who earn their living in the business are paid directly from the business. There is no such thing here as corporations or trusts or anything of that kind so far as the fishing is concerned. There are, of course, companies which pack and preserve the fish after it has been bought by them and delivered to them, and there are companies which have interests in the fishing vessels; but the men who do the fishing, the men whose case I am trying to plead, depend for their livelihood on the result of their hands and their own catch. They are now to be displaced; their places will be taken by the Canadian and Newfoundland vessels. They will be forced to seek a living elsewhere.

We have pretty well rid ourselves of our merchant marine, and now we are preparing to take our flag from the seas where it still floats on the fishing vessels. Mr. President, I suppose it is thought that this is a small industry, perhaps; but even in the part of which I speak, which is only a fragment of it, there are 4,500 men who go out to the banks on the Gloucester fleet alone. That means a good many people dependent upon the earnings of those fishermen. There are 22,000 men engaged in the fisheries in New England. If we go farther afield, we find that Maryland has 18,000; Virginia, 20,000; New York, 18,000; California, Oregon, and Washington, 14,000; and the Lakes, 7,000. On the Lakes and in the Northwest, where the fisheries are just beginning to be developed, of course this matter of putting fresh fish, smoked, pickled, and frozen fish on the free list is a heavy handicap to them, as it is to those on the east coast. The difference is that only the east-coast fishermen of Canada, so far as I know, receive the Government bounty, and I do not think it is distributed yet to the fishermen of the west coast.

In a case where we are getting revenue from an article, where there has been no advance in price, where everyone

knows that the removal of the duty will not alter the cost of fish to the consumer at all, it seems to me utterly unfair, it seems to me cruel, to put this branch of the industry out of existence and to injure the industry as a whole everywhere.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have been following the Senator's interesting discussion of this paragraph, but I desire to inquire just how and to what extent this bounty is distributed? I do not think the Senator stated it.

Mr. LODGE. One hundred and sixty thousand dollars, the interest of the Halifax award, is distributed directly to the Canadian fishermen. It is given to the owners. I do not know whether they fish on shares, as we do, or not; but it is given in cash directly to the owners of the Canadian fishing vessels. I suppose it is pro rata, according to the tonnage of the vessels or the number of men on board. It is distributed in cash. The other help is indirect, in the form of rebates on the railroads, aid in the cold-storage warehouses, and so forth.

Here, then, we have a situation where it is utterly impossible for our men to compete. This bill simply gives the industry to the Canadian fishermen, wipes out the American fishermen of the banks and the treaty waters, and, so far as I can see, gets absolutely nothing in return. We do not get cheaper fish. We get no benefit to the consumer. We throw away revenue. We extinguish a portion of a great industry.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I think I can tell him where he can get the information asked for—from the Commercial Handbook of Canada. He can find there just what the bounty is and how it is paid.

Mr. LODGE. I am very much obliged to the Senator.

According to this volume the fishing bounty was first paid by the Dominion Government in 1882. As I read the totals, nearly \$5,000,000 have been paid out. The highest bounty paid per head—it is paid per head and to vessels—to vessel fishermen was \$21.75 in 1893; the lowest, 83 cents:

In 1908 vessels received \$1 per ton up to 80 tons; vessel fishermen, \$7.25 each; boats, \$1 each; boat fishermen, \$3.90 per man. The Canadian Government received, through the Imperial Government, \$4,490,882 as Canada's share in the fishery award made in 1877. Under the terms of the treaty of Washington, 1871, an amount equal to the interest of this sum was appropriated for bounty purposes to encourage deep-sea fishing on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the discussion, and I should like to inquire upon what theory the Canadian Government contributes such a liberal bounty to their fishermen. What are the purposes which they seek to serve by so doing?

Mr. LODGE. They think it a very important industry to be maintained. They have always been buoyed up by the hope, which has been gratified at times by reciprocity arrangements, that they could get free entry into the American market. They believe, and I think they believe rightly, that if they pay bounties to their fishermen and encourage them in every possible way, and if we take off our duty and give nothing to our fishermen, they will get complete control of the American market. I think they are right as to that.

Mr. NELSON. Is it not a fact, too, that in respect to Newfoundland fishing is the only industry of any consequence, and unless it is fortified and maintained there hardly anybody will be left on the island?

Mr. LODGE. What the Senator says is absolutely true. I was about to make that statement.

Mr. NELSON. And it is such a distinct and important industry that I imagine that is one reason why Newfoundland did not enter the Dominion. Newfoundland is not a part of the Dominion Government to-day.

Mr. LODGE. No; it is not in the Dominion.

Mr. NELSON. It is an independent Province, distinct from all the other Canadian Provinces; and I think the fishing industry is the main cause of that. It is the life of the country.

Mr. LODGE. It is; and the Senator, I think, is quite right in saying that they stayed out of the Dominion Government largely because they wished, if possible, to make separate arrangements with us, which they have been trying to do through reciprocity treaties. Now, we are going to give our market to them for nothing. Fishing is really the only industry of Newfoundland that is of the slightest consequence. It is the only industry, and in Newfoundland the vessels are all owned by what are known as the planters; that is, they are men of capital and corporations in St. Johns. They own the entire fishing fleet; and the inhabitants of the west coast, who do a great deal of the fishing there, are in a state of the greatest poverty.

In fact, it was made an issue in one of the recent elections in Newfoundland.

I do not know about the comparative labor cost. I made no attempt to show any difference in labor cost between the Canadian fishermen and the American fishermen; but there is no question that the Newfoundland boats, run as they are, and all in the hands of these rich owners in St. Johns, are run very much cheaper than ours, and I rather think somewhat cheaper than the Canadian boats; and, of course, they come in, too. They have besides the natural geographical advantage of neighborhood.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I find also, while the Senator is speaking on that subject, that—

Fish and other products of the fisheries of Newfoundland may be imported into Canada free of customs duty unless otherwise determined by the governor in council, by order published in the Canada Gazette; and fish caught by fishermen in Canadian fishing vessels and the product thereof carried from the fisheries in such vessels shall be admitted into Canada free of duty, under regulations of the minister of customs.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; they let in the Newfoundland fish free, while they have a duty on our fish. I have said nothing about the duty. The bounty is enough.

Mr. NELSON. I also wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that France has two islands for fishery purposes at or near the Newfoundland banks, which they retained under the treaty when they relinquished Quebec; and that is a great fishing ground for the Frenchmen.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; the French Government retained the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. The Breton fishermen come there, as they have come since the sixteenth century; but, of course, the product of the French fisheries is all taken to France.

Mr. President, these fishermen are a strong and hardy race. Their occupation is one involving a great deal of danger. Of late years the death list, I am happy to say, has been much reduced; but for a period of 25 years, up to a comparatively short time ago, the average loss of life every season in the Gloucester fisheries reached 100 and over.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to inquire of the Senator if this policy of paying a bounty, in his judgment, has been inaugurated because this was regarded as a desirable occupation for British subjects in order to recruit sailors for their navy? Does that enter at all into the question?

Mr. LODGE. The bounty is given by the Dominion Government. I do not know whether that consideration has entered into the matter at all or not as a source of supply for the British fleet, but I think it highly probable that it has. In France the fishermen are encouraged. They receive bounties. They have special licenses which give them the sole right to fish. In return each one of the Breton fishermen has to serve three years in the navy; then he gets his license, and he gets certain privileges, and every ship is given a bounty.

Mr. PERKINS. We have given bounties, too, at times.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; as the Senator from California suggests, there have been periods when we have given bounties. It has been the general policy of the world to encourage fisheries with a view of making them a nursery of seamen.

With our great population, relatively few come from the fisheries, I suppose; but when the Spanish War occurred Gloucester sent a larger percentage of men into the Navy of the United States than any city or town in the country. While in seacoast cities like New York and Boston the average of men passed as physically fit for the Navy was only some 14 per cent, in Gloucester over 75 per cent passed. They sent nearly 500 men into the Navy. From a small town like Gloucester that was a pretty good contribution.

I asked an admiral of the Navy about those men. He said, "Why, they were the best men we could possibly get. We did not have to teach them anything. The moment they were on board the ship they knew the whole thing. You could put them into a boat and send them anywhere to do anything. They had to learn about big guns, and that was all." He told me that most of them rose to be boatswains and warrant officers at once.

They are a good population. They are a hardy, hard-working population. They carry on their industry at the risk of their lives in the gray and stormy seas of the North Atlantic. I think they are the kind of population it is well to encourage, just as it is well to encourage the men of the farm.

I am not saying what I do as to the danger to the northeastern fisheries as a matter of alarm. There is not any question about it; it is utterly impossible for our people to carry

on the bank fisheries in competition with the bounty-fed fisheries of Canada and the poorly paid fisheries of Newfoundland. We can not do it. The bank fishermen of New England, of Massachusetts and Maine, where most of them are, will go out of existence.

I can see no reason whatever, on any principle of revenue or of protection or of free trade, for handing over our industries to our neighbors on the north who see fit to give a bounty to their fishermen. I can not see any reason for it, except, I suppose, that it is thought it would make an engaging cry upon the stump. That seems to be, as far as I can make out, the one coherent principle that runs through this bill. Will it make a pleasant cry when you get on the stump? "We have given you free fish; we have not cheapened it, but we have given you free fish. We have given you free sugar; we have not cheapened it, but you have free sugar. We have taken the duty off meat and off wheat, and so on." They will not lower the price by doing it. But it makes a pleasant cry upon the stump; and I can see no principle in such a plan as this, putting fish on the free list, except the principle of the stump speech, which is not an economic principle but a means of vote catching.

Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to go in as a new paragraph before paragraph 221.

The SECRETARY. On page 60, after line 6, insert as a new paragraph:

220½. Herrings, pickled or salted, smoked or kippered, ½ of 1 cent per pound; herrings, fresh, ¾ of 1 cent per pound. Fish, fresh, smoked, dried, salted, pickled, frozen, packed in ice or otherwise prepared for preservation, not specially provided for in this section, ¾ of 1 cent per pound; fish, skinned or boned, 1½ cents per pound; mackerel, halibut, or salmon, fresh, pickled, or salted, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to section 5 of the bill. If the bounty system in Canada operates as a discrimination against us with regard to our fisheries, in section 5 the President—

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, I examined that with great care in the hope that there might be something there, but there is not. There is no discrimination against the United States in that bounty. It applies to all the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It says here:

Which unduly or unfairly discriminates against the United States or the products thereof.

Mr. LODGE. It does not mention a bounty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; it does not mention eo nomine a bounty. It provides—

That whenever the President shall ascertain as a fact that any country, dependency, colony, province, or other political subdivision of government imposes any restrictions, either in the way of tariff rates or provisions, trade or other regulations, charges or exactions, or in any other manner, directly or indirectly, upon the importations into or sale in such foreign country of any agricultural, manufactured, or other product of the United States which—

"Which" refers back to all that—

which unduly or unfairly discriminates against the United States or the products thereof—

Then, the next clause is when found unduly discriminating upon the exportation of any article to the United States from that country, "or"—the next one is pretty broad—

does not accord to the products of the United States reciprocal and equivalent treatment, he—

That is, the President—

shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to suspend by proclamation the operation of the provisions of this act.

And the first mentioned among the list of things upon which he may make this readjustment are "fish, fresh, smoked, and dried, pickled, or otherwise prepared."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I examined that provision with the most anxious care, for I was in strong hopes that I could find something in it, something which would enable the President to impose the duties provided for in section 5 in the case of the payment of the Canadian bounty, but there is nothing in the wording of that section which gives him any power to do it. There is nothing discriminatory against the United States either in the duty that Canada imposes or the bounty she pays. To give the President power to act under section 5 there has to be a discrimination, and there is no discrimination here. It operates against us, and against us alone, it is very true, but it stands in the law as applying to all the world. There is no discrimination against our products, and the bounty is, of course, a domestic affair and does not come within that clause. I wish it did come within it, but there is no relief there.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts is the present law.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; it is the present law. It was not raised in 1909. It was not left entirely unchanged. It was reduced in some forms.

Mr. BRISTOW. I notice in the handbook that the ad valorem equivalent on the importations of 1910 for the first bracket was 6.72 per cent; on the second bracket, 12.86 per cent; on the third, 12.79 per cent; on the fourth, 13.32 per cent; and on the fifth, 16.20 per cent. That, I understand, is the ad valorem equivalent which these specific duties would impose. So the highest would be only a little over 16 per cent.

Mr. LODGE. The highest would be 16 per cent and the lowest 6 per cent. I am much obliged to the Senator from Kansas for calling attention to that, because it is a point which I overlooked.

The existing duties are very low. The duties imposed are nothing but revenue duties, really, and why should that revenue be thrown away when you will not reduce the result of the reduction to the consumer? You throw away that revenue simply to give the whole business to the foreigner, to the Canadian, favored and supported by the bounty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I find that the importations of fish of all sorts in the year 1910, the only year for which I have the full figures—I have them partly for the next year—amounted to \$3,931,863, in round numbers \$4,000,000, and the total consumption was twelve and one-half million dollars. It does not seem that we have suffered very much in the matter of "invasion" or "inundation" of imports.

Mr. LODGE. I said when I began that 25 per cent of the fish consumed in the United States were imported, from which we get revenue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, that equivalent ad valorem under the Payne tariff law was 29.9 per cent upon fish in oil or in oil and other substances.

Mr. LODGE. I have not been discussing any fish in oil. Those are taken care of. Those are the fisheries of the Maine coast.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator need not get excited. I am discussing all of them.

Mr. LODGE. I am not getting excited. I was getting emphatic.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, emphatic, then. I am discussing the equivalent ad valorem. Taking the entire paragraph and the average ad valorem, we have only reduced it four and a fraction per cent, from 29.37 to 23.21, except when we come to caviar, which we have regarded as a luxury, and on which we have kept up the original figure. Fish, skinned or boned, we have reduced 50 per cent.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not want to argue the case, but where less than one-third of the total consumption was imported—

Mr. LODGE. The figures the Senator from Mississippi has been reading—the paragraph he has been discussing—I have not alluded to at all. You have blotted out half the fish duty. Those are the ones I am speaking of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You are talking of fresh fish?

Mr. LODGE. I am not speaking of the protection on the Maine sardine.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You are speaking about fresh fish.

Mr. LODGE. Fresh fish, salted fish, frozen fish, pickled fish.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As to fresh fish, we have placed them upon the free list.

Mr. LODGE. You have also smoked, dried, frozen, and pickled, and all the salted fishes except sardines.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All right, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who is absent from the Chamber. I will transfer the pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. I vote "yea."

Mr. SHEPPARD (when Mr. CULBERSON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] to the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLE] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I again transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Root] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Gore]. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement I made on the last roll call, I vote "nay." The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I wish to announce the pair of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] with the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. BRYAN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the affirmative). I ask if the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with that Senator. I transfer it to the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], and let my vote stand.

Mr. LANE. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Brady	Dillingham	Lodge	Sherman
Brandegge	Fall	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Gallinger	Nelson	Smoot
Burton	Gronna	Norris	Sutherland
Cañon	Jones	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Perkins	Weeks
Crawford	La Follette	Polindexter	

NAYS—36.

Ashurst	Kern	Pomerene	Smith, Ariz.
Bacon	Lane	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Lewis	Reed	Swanson
Bryan	Martin, Va.	Robinson	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Martine, N. J.	Saulsbury	Thompson
Fletcher	Myers	Shafroth	Thornton
Hollis	O'Gorman	Sheppard	Tillman
Hughes	Overman	Shively	Walsh
James	Owen	Simmons	Williams

NOT VOTING—32.

Borah	Cummins	Lippitt	Smith, Ga.
Bradley	du Pont	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Burleigh	Goff	Newlands	Stephenson
Chamberlain	Gore	Oliver	Sterling
Chilton	Hitchcock	Penrose	Stone
Clapp	Jackson	Pittman	Townsend
Cole	Johnson	Root	Vardaman
Culberson	Lea	Shields	Works

So Mr. LODGE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senator having the bill in charge to the last two lines of paragraph 222. The present law in relation to pineapples preserved in their own juice reads:

Pineapples preserved in their own juice, not having sugar, spirits, or molasses added thereto.

I remember very well why those words were included in the law of 1909. In the law of 1897 they were not included, and the words of the law of 1897 are the words used in the pending bill. The question arose in a good many cases as to what it actually meant, and there were a number of decisions and endless litigation on it, it being held that pineapples containing up to 33 per cent sugar were not dutiable as fruits preserved in sugar, but pineapples preserved in their own juice.

It is possible that this provision would be interpreted as indicating an intention on the part of the Congress to single out pineapples from the general provision of fruit containing sugar. Therefore I offer an amendment. After the word "juice," in line 6, page 61, I move to insert the words:

Not having sugar, spirits, or molasses added thereto.

I will assure the Senator from Mississippi if those words are not included in this law the same litigation will be passed through again that was passed through under the law of 1897. I ask for a vote upon the amendment, unless the Senator will accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is paragraph 222. Paragraph 221 has not yet been passed upon.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The litigation to which the Senator from Utah refers seems to have been a litigation which was carried to a conclusion. The principle involved seems to have been adjudicated, for I find that it was held in a number of decisions that pineapples containing up to 33 per cent of sugar were not dutiable as fruits preserved in sugar but as fruits preserved in their own juice. I suppose the idea in the mind of the House was to permit this leeway of 33 per cent, which is

the decision under the previous law, where the language of the bill as passed by the House was decided to be a line of demarcation between pineapples preserved in their own juice and artificially treated with sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. The result will be that if we strike out these words now, after the litigation which has been passed through, the importers will take it that we have singled out pineapples only, whereas this applies to all kinds of fruits; and with those words in there would be no question about it.

I think I have done my duty in offering this amendment, and if the Senator does not want to accept it, of course, well and good.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe I should like to have that suggestion go back to the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. That will be perfectly satisfactory, Mr. President. I offered it with no intention of finding fault whatever.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe I would rather look into it a little further. My own opinion is that the intention of the House was to allow 33 per cent sugar content to be regarded as pineapples preserved in their own juice. But I would rather look into it a little further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph goes back to the committee.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 221 has not yet been passed on by the Senate. The committee amendment has not been acted upon.

Mr. JONES. If paragraph 221 has not been passed upon I want to ask the Senator in charge of this part of the bill a question. Under the first part of paragraph 221 the average rate at the present time is twenty-nine and a fraction per cent. The House reduced it to 20 per cent. The committee has raised it to 25 per cent. In the other bracket the present rate is 30 per cent for fish not specially provided for in tin packages, and so forth. The committee has reduced that 50 per cent. Upon what theory did the committee make so much greater reduction on that bracket than on the first?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will state, Mr. President, that when we came to the first part of the paragraph there was a good deal of complaint here. On the coast of Maine they capture a little herring and can it and call it a sardine. I reckon it is just about as good as the sardine, except that it is not. The Maine fishing laws are so much more stringent than the laws just across in Nova Scotia regarding fishing in season and all that, that those people convinced the subcommittee, of which I was a member, that with the duty as fixed by the House they would have to move their plants over to Nova Scotia. Not being desirous of uselessly injuring anybody in connection with an article which was not an absolute necessity, and believing we would get as good a revenue for a reason which I will explain in a moment, we raised that duty.

Mr. JONES. I am not complaining about that raise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand the Senator. I am stating the distinction which we made. Then we concluded that the sardine that is really imported is the genuine Mediterranean sardine, which is a luxury. The so-called sardines up there in Maine are canned and sold for 6 cents or 5 cents a box. These others, Mediterranean, sell, as we know, up to 20 and 30 cents. We concluded that they would all come in anyhow, and if we raised the duty 5 per cent above the House rate we would not import any less sardines and we would get a better revenue.

When we came to the second part of the paragraph we found that nobody took the trouble to make any complaint. We found by experience that when those who have a special interest in this kind of business need protection there is complaint. The rate was certainly high enough. The only question was whether it was not too high.

Mr. JONES. I wish to ask whether canned salmon come under the second bracket? I think they do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Are they put up in oil?

Mr. JONES. I do not think so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If they are they come under the first bracket; if not, they come under the second.

Mr. JONES. I think they come under the second. I am not sure but that I have some letters in reference to that proposition, and I should like the matter to go over until I can examine it and see whether or not I have some suggestions with reference to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing to do that.

We passed over while the Senator was out paragraph 222. As the Senator has come back, is he ready to take that up now?

Mr. JONES. I am ready.

Mr. SMOOT. In connection with paragraph 221, before we pass upon the increased rate, I simply want to say that on fish

where the specific rate is $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents, the equivalent ad valorem is 20.21 per cent. I take for granted that the Senator, from his statement, stated the fact—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I stated the facts as they were represented to me; I do not know.

Mr. JONES. I will say I have no objection to a vote on the committee amendment. Then I should like to have the paragraph go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 60, line 9, paragraph 221, after the word "cans," strike out "20" and insert "25," so as to make the paragraph read:

221. Fish, except shellfish, by whatever name known, packed in oil or in oil and other substances, in bottles, jars, kegs, tin boxes, or cans, 25 per cent ad valorem; all other fish, except shellfish, in tin packages, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; caviar and other preserved roe of fish, 30 per cent ad valorem; fish, skinned or boned, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. In paragraph 222, line 15, page 60, I move to strike out "10" and insert "13" before "cents."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That paragraph has been by unanimous consent recommitted to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the President's pardon if he so understood me. I asked that the last clause of the paragraph, "pineapples preserved in their own juice, 20 per cent ad valorem," be recommitted to the committee. The balance of the paragraph I did not ask to have recommitted. The amendment is in order now.

Mr. JONES. I thought we could dispose of my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be set aside, then, referring it to the committee. The amendment of the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 60, line 15, paragraph 222, before the word "cents," strike out "10" and in lieu insert "13," so as to read:

Apples, peaches, quinces, cherries, plums, and pears, green or ripe, 13 cents per bushel of 50 pounds.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, just a word. The tariff on apples, peaches, and so forth, going into Canada is 13 cents for 50 pounds. The only complaint I have from our growers with reference to this provision in the bill is that we are placing the tariff lower than the adjoining country. The tariff now is 25 cents on 50 pounds. The House has cut that to 10 cents. Our people ask that we put them, as far as the tariff is concerned, upon an equality with our Canadian friends across the line. They can not understand why we should voluntarily place our tariff below that of the adjoining country. They are not objecting to a reduction of the tariff, and they are not objecting to a large reduction, but they can not understand why, when we are making a reduction of duties on imports into this country, we should put the tariff 3 cents below what they put upon our fruit going into that country. That is the principal reason why I offer this amendment.

I suppose that labor conditions in connection with the growing of fruit are very much the same in Canada as labor conditions in this country, except that I am satisfied that as to a great many sections the land values are much higher in this country than they are in Canada. I know that to the north of my State in the central part, there are several hundred thousand, if not two or three million, acres of land that are being irrigated and have been planted largely with fruit trees which are coming into bearing and which will form a very formidable and very active competition in our own markets with our own fruit.

It does seem to me that it is nothing but fair and right that we should place upon fruit coming from another country the same rate at least that they impose against fruit from our country. Of course, I recognize that this rate applies to all countries, but I think the main competition comes from our northern neighbor. So I hope the committee will not oppose fixing this duty at the low rate of 13 cents, instead of 10 cents a bushel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There could not be any more unsound rule of taxation adopted in the world than to fix your rate because some other nation had fixed the same or a higher rate against you. If they had fixed the same rate against you for protective purposes, it was because they thought you could undersell them. That would tend to show that for protective purposes you did not need any rate at all. If they fixed it for revenue purposes, then when you came to fix your rate for revenue purposes, you ought to fix it by the rate that you thought would give you the most revenue with the least burden. We thought 10 cents would give enough. Apples do not need any protection that I

know of from Canada, nor, by the way, do Canadian apples need any from us. To say that because Canada wants to punish her people who want to buy American apples from Washington and Oregon by making them pay 13 cents a bushel more, even if true, is no reason why we should make our people pay 3 cents a bushel more for Canadian apples if they want them, if we think 10 cents is a sufficient revenue to raise upon apples.

Mr. JONES. Of course, I understand that this bill is framed with no purpose whatever of protecting our people from anybody else; that it is framed entirely for revenue purposes; and yet I have noticed very frequently that in explanations made with reference to why a duty is placed at this or why it is placed at that rate, other conditions have been taken into account in a great many instances.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Undoubtedly; but the other conditions do not exist in this case.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes; of course it is not identical with some conditions that exist in another case; and yet this simply illustrates how easy it is to justify a rate under a bill framed for purposes of revenue. Of course if any objection is made to a rate, you can say "we simply put it on at that rate for revenue purposes," and that is all there is to it. Well, there is no answer, of course, to that proposition. Then in another case, if you want to justify it on another ground, you are at perfect liberty to do it. It shows the elasticity of framing a tariff bill "for revenue only."

It does seem to me, however, where there is a country that is likely to be a competitor in an article in which our people are very much interested, that it is justifiable for us in framing our tariff to take into account their tariff on the same proposition.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The higher the protection, then, that Canadians thought they needed against you, the higher would be the protection that you think you need against them. That is the logic of the argument. I leave it to fall by its own weight.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I again transfer my general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement in regard to my pair and its transfer which I made upon the last roll call, I will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LANE. I wish to again announce that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is unavoidably absent, and that he is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make the same announcement I made on the previous roll call as to my pair and its transfer, and I will vote. I vote "nay." I desire this announcement to stand for the remainder of the day.

Mr. BRYAN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—25.			
Brady	Jones	Page	Sutherland
Brandegge	Kenyon	Perkins	Thornton
Bristow	La Follette	Poinexter	Warren
Burton	Lodge	Sherman	Weeks
Catron	McLean	Smith, Mich.	
Gallinger	Nelson	Smoot	
Gronna	Norris	Sterling	
NAYS—36.			
Ashurst	Kern	Pomerene	Smith, Ariz.
Bacon	Lane	Ransdell	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Martin, Va.	Reed	Swanson
Bryan	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Myers	Saulsbury	Thompson
Fletcher	O'Gorman	Shafroth	Tillman
Hollis	Overman	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hughes	Owen	Shively	Walsh
James	Pittman	Simmons	Williams

NOT VOTING—34.

Borah
Bradley
Burleigh
Chamberlain
Chilton
Clapp
Clark, Wyo.
Colt
Crawford

Culberson
Cummins
Dillingham
du Pont
Fall
Goff
Gore
Hitchcock
Jackson

Johnson
Lea
Lewis
Lippitt
McCumber
Newlands
Oliver
Penrose
Root

Shields
Smith, Ga.
Smith, Md.
Stephenson
Stone
Townsend
Works

So the amendment of Mr. JONES was rejected.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, is the paragraph still open to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is still open to amendment.

Mr. WEEKS. On page 60, line 17, I move to amend by striking out the figures "10" and insert the figures "25," so as to read:

Cranberries, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the reason I move this amendment is that the only supply of cranberries we obtain in this country, except what are produced here, comes from Canada, and the Canadian preferential rate of duty is 17½ per cent; the intermediate rate is 22½ per cent; and the regular rate, which applies against this country, is 25 per cent. I see no reason for making our rate on cranberries lower than the rate which Canada imposes on our cranberries, especially when the cranberries produced in the United States come from States comparatively near the Canadian line.

Mr. THORNTON. Did I understand the Senator from Massachusetts to say that the Canadian rate was 25 per cent?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; the rate is 25 per cent against us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In order to keep the record straight, the Chair will state that the paragraph is recommitted to the Committee on Finance.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read paragraph 226.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair inquires of the Senator from Mississippi whether paragraph 223 went over? It was so announced awhile since.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I did not so understand. I heard no request to that effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so understood.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That paragraph did not go over, so far as I know.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment to paragraph 223 will now be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Finance reported an amendment to paragraph 223, on page 61, line 10, before the words "per pound," by striking out "2 cents" and inserting "1 cent," so as to make the paragraph read:

223. Figs, 2 cents per pound; plums, prunes, and prunelles, 1 cent per pound; raisins and other dried grapes, 2 cents per pound; dates, 1 cent per pound; currants, Zante or other, 1 cent per pound; olives, 15 cents per gallon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 227, page 62, line 3, after the word "thousand," to insert "bananas, one-tenth of 1 cent per pound," so as to make the paragraph read:

227. Pineapples, in barrels or other packages, 6 cents per cubic foot of the capacity of the barrels or packages; in bulk, \$5 per thousand; bananas, one-tenth of 1 cent per pound.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I trust this amendment recommended by the Finance Committee will not be adopted. The banana is one of a multitude of items upon which this bill proposes to levy a duty where no duty existed before, and I think it one of the most objectionable products which could have been selected for that purpose. If the committee intends to adopt the principle of levying duties upon noncompeting products, there is an immense field from which they could have drawn. It would include coffee, it would include tea, and, passing to the category of materials for manufacture, it would have included crude rubber. Bananas are certainly the most objectionable of them all, because they are a food of the poor, a food which is increasing enormously in use in our own country.

I have before me an article in the latest issue of the North American Review, by Chester Lloyd Jones, professor in the University of Wisconsin, in which he gives some valuable figures in regard to the increase in the consumption of this article. It appears that in the year 1912 continental United States alone consumed 44,520,530 bunches of bananas, or over 60 bananas

for each man, woman, and child in the Union. That means between 25 and 30 pounds per inhabitant.

The consumers of this article include a large number of our foreign population—Italians, perhaps, more than any others. I have a communication from the east side of the city of New York in which it is stated that it is becoming a leading article of food there. Some years ago it may have been regarded as a quasi luxury, but it is not now, by any means, and it is especially the food of those who desire to economize by avoiding the purchase of the more expensive articles of diet.

Another set of figures which show how the consumption has increased is derived from the value of the imports. In 1900 the value of the imports of bananas into the United States was \$5,877,835. By 1910 the value had reached \$11,642,000; and in 1912 the value of the imports was \$14,368,000, nearly three times as great a value as in the year 1900.

Up to date much the larger share of the consumption of bananas has been in the United States—probably more than four-fifths of the whole. Bananas, however, are now becoming a prominent article of food in other countries. At Manchester in the year 1909 there was a warehouse which had been constructed for the express purpose of storing bananas, and ships were provided for the purpose of bringing them from the West Indies. Calculations evidently were made in reliance upon a great increase in the trade.

In France, in the year 1908, the imports were 5,697.6 tons; in 1911, 17,813 tons—three times as much. Germany took only 320 metric tons in 1899, but in 1911 the amount had increased to 30,438 tons. A similar increase is shown in Holland where, in the year 1907, 100 tons were brought in, while in 1910, 3,000 tons were imported.

This increase in the consumption in other countries assumes especial importance, because, at least according to the theory upon which this bill seems to have been framed, countries which buy articles like bananas give their own products in exchange, and the great increase of banana imports in these other countries means an increase of their exports to the Caribbean countries where heretofore we have had the preponderance of trade.

In England there is no duty on bananas; in Germany there is none; in Holland there is no duty; in France there is a small duty, along with that on other kinds of fruit.

I wish to call attention in the next place, Mr. President, to the fact that bananas are purchased from countries with which we have the most friendly relations, and where year by year we are gaining the greater share of their trade.

Another point to be made in this connection—and it is a very important point—is that up to date nearly all of their exports to the United States are admitted free of duty. The banana is produced for the most part around the Caribbean Sea. Jamaica is the leading place of production. Next to Jamaica comes Honduras, next Costa Rica, then Panama, then Cuba and Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Colombia. Practically each of these countries supply the United States with more than a million bunches of bananas; indeed, bananas are the leading export in many of these countries.

The total value of the exports from Jamaica in the year 1912 was \$2,948,000. Of these exports bananas made up \$1,456,000, or very nearly half of the whole.

I call attention to the statistics in regard to cultivation: In the island of Jamaica of acres planted in sugar cane there were 34,766; planted in coffee, 24,433; in tobacco, 904; in bananas, 82,435, or considerably more than all the combined acreage of sugar cane, coffee, and tobacco.

The total value of the exports from Honduras in 1912 was \$630,146. I give the figures in pounds because they are derived from the Statesman's Yearbook. Of this value bananas made up \$267,535. From Costa Rica the total exports were valued at \$1,883,546, of which bananas made up \$890,870.

On the other hand, we have about two-thirds of the export trade of Jamaica. That island is coming to be like Canada, a country which, notwithstanding its political affiliations with England, nevertheless obtains the greatest share of its imported commodities from the United States.

Of the imports into Honduras in 1912, 71 per cent came from the United States; and of the imports into Costa Rica, 46.29 per cent.

Now, let us notice for a moment the treatment that we give to these countries as regards imports from them. In the year 1912, of the imports into the United States from Jamaica 96.46 per cent were free of duty. If this duty on bananas should be imposed, the percentage would be diminished from 96.46, I think, to a figure below 50.

Of the imports into the United States from Honduras in the same year, 99.78 per cent—very nearly all—came in free of

duty. A very radical change would be made in this regard, diminishing the percentage of nondutiable imports from nearly 100 to about one-half, and perhaps to a lower figure than that. I have not made the exact computation.

Of the imports into the United States from Costa Rica, 99.88 per cent were free of duty; of the imports from Nicaragua, 99.88 per cent—the same percentage—were free of duty.

It thus appears that we have given the most liberal treatment to the products of those countries. Several of them, especially those in Central America and Jamaica, depend in a very great degree for their prosperity on the sale of this article, and here it is proposed to change radically our relations with each of those countries by imposing, against their protest, a material duty on an essential article of food.

Mr. President, it was claimed by every Democratic speaker from the stump last autumn that one of the missions of the Democratic Party, one of the reasons why it should be intrusted with power was to diminish the price of food; and yet, with a multitude of other sources of revenue, one of the first things they do is to impose this duty, which, as it is computed, amounts to about 15.61 per cent, upon an article which I think I may say more than any other is the food of people of limited means in the United States. It seems to me it is an absolute betrayal of platform promises; it is imposing a tax upon the people who are subjected to the greatest hardship of any of our population in obtaining sufficient food for their sustenance. It sounds very small—one-tenth of 1 per cent—but everybody knows that with an imposition of the duty not only the amount of that duty is added, but there is the vexation and expenses of the custom-house and the change in the course of trade which is created by taking an article from the free list and putting it upon the dutiable list.

There is one other appeal which I desire to make in this connection, Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. If I remember correctly, when the Senator spoke upon the general subject of this bill about two weeks ago he stated that some proposed reductions or additions to the free list would not affect to the consumer the price of the article. I should like to ask him if he thinks this small duty would add to the price of the article to the consumer?

Mr. BURTON. If I did make any such reference—and I fancy I did—it was not to this class of articles at all.

Mr. THOMAS. I think it was sugar.

Mr. BURTON. Well, when we come to sugar I will discuss that and endeavor to show the exceptional conditions prevailing in that case. Sugar is an entirely different food from bananas.

Mr. THOMAS. It is a necessary of life, as I understand the Senator.

Mr. BURTON. Oh, yes. Another point everyone realizes is that sugar, having been produced as well as consumed here for many years, is an article of more general consumption than bananas, and that a very large share of those who buy it have ampler means and can more readily pay any tax.

Mr. THOMAS. I understood the Senator to say that bananas were becoming a general universal article of food—a necessity of life.

Mr. BURTON. Oh, I do not think I said that. I would say that they are becoming more and more the food of persons of more limited means. I mentioned some of those who purchased them.

Mr. President, if there is any one thing in our diplomatic political policy which we should observe now, it is friendly relations with the countries to the south of us. They have been misunderstood by the whole world. Their rich resources have been exploited by aliens from every land. The general opinion has come to be accepted that they are constantly engaged in revolutions and that they have the limitations that belong to a tropical climate and arise from the mingling of different races under the same political jurisdiction. But those who would be their most unfriendly critics must admit that they have made wonderful progress in the last few decades. That progress may not have been equal in all of them, but it has been most apparent in every one. Their future is bright. Our political, social, and economical relations with them must be closer every year.

We owe to them a peculiar responsibility. Just as the New World is geographically distinct from the Old World, so also it has its political affiliations and ties. If we should not succeed in establishing that comity and friendly relation with some of the countries of the eastern continent which we desire, there is at least the opportunity for us to manifest that consideration

for the States of Central and South America which the stronger should always give to the weaker, and to create those enduring relations of friendship which should exist between all the Americas. This will benefit us no less than them.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to say just a word in relation to this matter, in all kindness.

Out on the Pacific coast, and throughout the entire Northwest, the people have planted thousands and thousands of acres of their lands in orchards. I guess I am strictly within the bounds of fact when I say it has been done by the square mile. They will soon be in bearing, bearing apples and other fruits which are very much more nutritious and palatable than the banana shipped from the far southern countries. Those people are very anxious when the Panama Canal is opened, as it will be in a very short time, to come into the market on the Atlantic coast, where the people are so much in need of fruit. They wish to introduce their products there, and thereby to give mutual benefit to all parties concerned. I hope the Senator will take that matter into consideration. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] will confirm what I have said. There are a great many of these people on the Pacific coast.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I can confirm that, but I wish to ask the Senator whether or not this is intended as a protective duty?

Mr. LANE. No; I think not. I think it just accidentally happens that way. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I can not imagine any reason for mentioning this fact that in the Senator's State the production of apples is increasing, except that he looks askance upon the coming of the banana; that there is a pet product in his State to which he wishes to give preference and a peculiar advantage. He may call it protection, he may call it local interest or whatever it may be, but if his argument has any force it is that we should protect him against the growing importation of the banana. Yet, I do not expect that at any time in the discussion of this bill the Senator from Oregon will stray into the protective camp. He may come as far as the border of Oregon, but he will never come so far as to accept the general principle. It will not affect his action here in Washington.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me a moment further?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. The fact is, Senators, that the people in that part of the country have overplanted with orchards. There is no doubt that they have. It is a matter of necessity with them. You may lay aside any idea of protection or revenue or matters of that sort. Their very existence, almost, is dependent upon it. Anyhow, the facts exist, and I want to call your attention to it, and I hope you will be merciful to those people.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I think we are merciful to them when we pay 5 or 10 cents apiece for one of their apples. According to the principle I have heard advocated so much on the other side, practically there is no such thing as an oversupply of commodities. Like Adam and Eve when they were banished from the Garden of Eden, the world is all before them where to go. If there is a big supply in this country, they can ship to some other. I really think the Senator from Oregon will find that no matter how many acres his constituents plant in apples, there will be an ample market for them. We should like some of them here on the Atlantic coast. We are ready to consume them, and while we have not, perhaps, been very loudly complaining about the price, we would welcome a somewhat cheaper rate upon them than we have been enjoying in the past. I think probably if the price were lower we would consume more of them.

Mr. President, I regard this amendment here as altogether out of line with a rational protective policy. I regard it as imposing a burden upon a very large class of our people, including many of those who have come from abroad and with whom it is a favorite food, and again I say it is unjust to these countries around the Caribbean, after we have for years been practically admitting all their products free, to levy this duty and thus impose a serious handicap upon them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is a fact well known to those who know him and love him that when he does try to look serious nobody in the world can look more serious than my genial friend the Senator from Ohio. The country may believe to-morrow, when it reads what he has said, that he was distressed to death. Those of us who know him know that he was acting distress.

There is one consolation about this tax upon bananas, at any rate, and that is that every dollar of it will go into the Treasury of the people. When the people pay two and a quarter millions of dollars extra for their bananas, if the ultimate consumers

shall pay it, they will have the satisfaction of knowing that they still have the money; that while each individual buying bananas paid out his share of it, the people in the aggregate have it all, yet it can be devoted to the purposes of the Government.

When we taxed oranges and lemons and pineapples and limes and all these things, no voice of complaint was heard from the Senator from Ohio or from anybody else over there. Why? Because a part of those taxes went into the pockets of certain interested parties who had influence at the polls, who wanted a tax levied on the people in order that it might protect or, rather, profit them. Therefore there was a special interest underlying it. There is no special interest underlying a tax on bananas. Every dollar of the tax levied on the people, so far as bananas are concerned, will go to the Government.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Does not the Senator from Mississippi know that with the imposition of duties on raisins, prunes, oranges, and lemons, under the policy of the bill of 1890, the supply of those articles has so increased that not only is the larger share of the demand satisfied at home, but the prices now are cheaper than they were then?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator means to say that the imposition of a tax upon the various articles which he has mentioned caused them to go down in price, or if he means to say, still more extremely, that his purpose and the purpose of others in fixing the tax upon these articles was that they might be reduced in price, then he has said something that is precisely contrary to all that he and his party have professed, because they have professed that the purpose of levying the duty was to raise the price in order that the man who sold the product might make a better profit and pay his laborers higher wages. You may rest assured that wherever the levying of a protective tariff of any description has been followed by lower prices than existed before, it has not been because of the levying of the tax, but has been because of something else.

You may rest assured of the fact that wherever a protective tax has been followed by the result of reducing the price the tax has failed in the purpose for which it was levied. But if the new position all at once taken by the Senator from Ohio were correct, then I might arrive at the conclusion that perhaps Hawaii and Porto Rico, and perhaps the Philippines—as long as the blessed archipelago is under our flag; God grant that it may not be for too long—might succeed in producing enough bananas to cheapen the cost to the American consumer. But wherever his party has levied a duty, the purpose of the duty has failed if there has been a cheapening of the article.

I am not going to play with this proposition. Somebody is going to pay two and a quarter millions more for bananas. Of course they will have to do it. The tariff is a tax, and a tax is a burden, and somebody has to bear the burden. You can no more make people rich by burdening them than you can pull yourself over a fence by your boot straps; and when we levy this tax upon bananas somebody will have to pay it. Who? The consumer.

Who is the consumer? The general body of the American people. What is the burden? What is it on? If you ask me whether a tax is good or bad, I want to know first the rate of the tax, and I want to know next the article upon which it is levied, so that I may determine how burdensome it is to the general run of mankind.

I want to know how necessary it is in their lines.

Why, my friends, when people read the newspapers and the Record to-morrow, they will think that the Senator from Ohio almost cried when he talked about putting a duty of one-tenth of 1 cent per pound upon a "basic food product of the people" in the shape of bananas. Yet, if I am not mistaken, he was one of the gentlemen who wanted to keep a duty upon bread, and upon meat, and upon potatoes, and upon apples, and upon everything else under the sun.

I started to say something about "vota Italiano" at election time. Maybe that has something to do with it. We impose a duty of one-tenth of 1 cent per pound on bananas. It takes from four to five bananas to make a pound, depending upon the size of the banana. It would take five or six of these little Jamaican bananas to make a pound, I suppose—certainly five. One-fourth of one-tenth is one-fortieth of a cent on a banana. I have not the slightest doubt that this duty is going to impoverish the downtrodden workman of this country to the tune of one-fortieth of 1 cent for a banana; or, if it is one of the little Jamaican bananas, one-fiftieth of a cent for a banana.

This is one of the things where perhaps the burden will not fall on the man who eats the fruit. It must fall on somebody. I read the article to which the Senator refers. It was sent to every Senator here. It was very well written and very nice. I expect it was sent by the United Fruit Co. as a present to each Senator, in order that he might understand what the United Fruit Co. meant or wanted.

Bananas are sold in the grocery stores, and they are sold from the little carts on the street corners for the nickel. If every cent of this tax is reflected upon the man who buys a nickel's worth of bananas it will be one-fourteenth of 1 cent for each nickel's worth. Now, bananas are not a necessary article of food, of course. Every one must know that. Bananas are in the United States a luxury. Every one of us knows that. They are a luxury which many poor people love and many poor people eat. In proportion as that is true they ought not to be made more costly to the people. Nevertheless, when you begin to talk about foodstuffs no American considers the banana a regular article of diet of the American people.

We have not yet even learned to cook bananas green, as they do down in South and Central America, where they do more nearly take the place of a regular food. We eat them simply as a fruit. They are no more a part of our food in this country than oranges, not so much as apples are, and yet these same gentlemen who quarrel about a duty of one-tenth of a cent per pound on bananas were trying half an hour ago to put a duty of 25 cents a bushel on apples!

I am afraid they think there is politics in this banana duty, and perhaps there may be; and perhaps for a little while somebody will carry it out to the consumer and lay the tax upon him. But very soon afterwards the man who does that will have to compete with the other little fellows that are peddling bananas, and with the other little grocers that are selling bananas; and I am almost tempted to say that this is one tax that will not be reflected in the final price to the men who eat the bananas. The United Fruit Co. will have to pay it. The jobbers will have to pay the United Fruit Co. The grocery men will have to pay them. But the amount of profit upon bananas now, between the time they are imported into New York and the time they go down the throats of the men who buy and eat them, is about 100 per cent. The present price is made up in the meantime in the processes between the United Fruit Co. and the purchaser from the fruit stand. Carry one-tenth of 1 cent per pound down through all these processes and see what will become of it.

If this duty adds anything to the price to the consumer it will add one-tenth of 1 cent per pound. If it is lost in the shuffle, as I verily believe it will be, somebody will have to make 99.9 per cent profit instead of 100 per cent profit.

Competition with abundant margin for competition may take care of that.

If not, nobody will be bankrupted and the suffering poor will not suffer more than one-fortieth of 1 cent than they suffer now.

I read the article that has been referred to and so abundantly quoted by the Senator from Ohio; and, as I have said, it is delightfully well written. It is remarkable that it should have come out just at this time, too, and that it should have been worded or headed or entitled the way it was. You would have thought the man who wrote it had no reference to anything in the world but the beautiful international relations between us and Jamaica and Central and South America. Beautiful coincidence!

The United Fruit Co. imports nearly all the bananas that are imported into the United States. I have forgotten the proportion; I had it in the subcommittee, but I have forgotten it now. My recollection is that it is about two-thirds, but I am not sure of that.

Mr. SIMMONS. Practically all except those that come from Jamaica.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Practically all except about one-third of those that come from Jamaica. It not only does that, but it owns the ships in which they are brought; and that is not all. It has gone down there and has begun to buy up the lands, and it uses its ships to oppress the other people who raise bananas. It brings bananas from its plantations in Central America and the West Indies into this country in good condition when they are ripe, or when they are at the stage where they will become ripe by the time they reach this country; and they tell the other fellow whose fruit is spoiling on the tree that they "have not room for his fruit this trip." In my private opinion, the United Fruit Co. will pay most of this tax in the long run.

But suppose every man that buys a banana, every child that buys one, and everybody that goes to a circus and gets one at the circus, pays this duty at the rate of one-fiftieth of a cent per banana or one-fortieth of a cent per banana more than he would have paid otherwise. You still have the consolation of knowing

that every dollar, every dime, every nickel, every cent of the two and a quarter million dollars is in your Treasury and still belongs to you, and that it was a real governmental tax levied and received by the Government, and that it did not leak on the way into the pocket of some private special purpose.

Mr. President, the Government has a right to tax me. I have said several times that it has a right to take 10 per cent or 50 per cent or 100 per cent of all I have, if necessary, in order to answer governmental purposes. It has a right to tax me on tobacco or on bananas or on land or in any other way it chooses that is necessary. But from my standpoint it has not any right to take one nickel out of my pocket in order to put it into the pocket of the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Wisconsin.

True, the people pay this tax, but the people get the money. These other taxes—protective taxes—which never distressed any of the gentlemen, who have suddenly discovered what a basic food product bananas are, leak on the way in greater or less proportions, and instead of landing in the people's Treasury they land in somebody's private treasury.

This is absolutely a revenue duty, with not even incidental protection to any soul in the world. Senators on the other side have been twitting us about not having enough duties of that sort. This is one that is all right, at any rate.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I present a protest to the President and Congress, signed by a large number of citizens, many of whom live in the north end of Boston, a section of the city that is occupied very largely by those of foreign birth or parentage. I should like to have the protest read and printed as a part of my remarks, without taking the time to read the names, which, however, I wish printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

To Hon. President Wilson and the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, respectfully and earnestly petition you not to impose the proposed tax on bananas. The banana, as we all know, is scarcely less nutritious than milk, and long ago ceased to be a luxury. To-day the banana is universally regarded as one of the necessities of life. The price of bananas, instead of going up as have the most of the other foodstuffs, has gone down, and the quality of the fruit has been greatly improved. To impose this tax would mean to increase the present burden of the high cost of living.

[NOTE.—Original signatures of names below have been sent to Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States.]

Aracelis Bros. Co., Boston, Mass.; Joseph A. De Pesa, 302 Main Street, Medford, Mass.; Howard Halpin, 21 Prescott Street, Everett, Mass.; Ralph Santesness, 9 Ambrose Street, Revere, Mass.; Fred J. Martell, 14 West Dedham Street, Boston; Martin E. Adams, 87 Highland Road, Somerville, Mass.; John Halpin, 45 Pierce Avenue, Everett, Mass.; G. C. Di Fatta, 15 Claybourne Street, Dorchester; Achilles Forte, 322 Hanover Street, Boston; Alfonso Gaeti, 708 Broadway, Revere; E. C. Burbank, 39 True Street, Revere; J. D. Zolla, 43 Tremont Street, Boston; L. A. Repetto, 10 Tremont Street, Boston; V. Garro, 286 Hanover Street, Boston; J. Pinkofsky, 13 Cottage Street, Revere; T. H. Kelley, 44 Hanover Street, Boston; A. C. Pettengill, Hotel Brewster, Boston; A. White, 22 Hanover Street, Boston; C. E. Leonardi, 43 Tremont Street, Boston; A. E. Crisafi, 276 Hanover Street, Boston; C. Dellorusso, 21 Chelsea Street, Boston; L. De Cane, 541 Park Street, Dorchester; C. Peyser, 63 Myrtle Street, Boston; A. Ianatto, 311 Howard Street, Boston; A. Terminetto, 41 London Street, East Boston; A. Pinkofsky, 2 Collamore Place, Boston; V. Corea, 139 Kittredge Street, Roslindale; Henry Santosuosso, 41 Clark Street, Boston; J. Rogers, 358 Hanover Street, Boston; D. Shaprio, 492 Tremont Street, Boston; E. Goldman, 23 Intervale Street, Roxbury; M. Liberman, 14 West Dedham Street, Boston; C. C. Coleman, 19 Banks Street, West Somerville; L. P. Woolf, 3 Spring Street, Dorchester; T. J. Grady, 43 Tremont Street, Boston; P. R. Zolla, 43 Tremont Street, Boston; J. F. Duffy, 43 Tremont Street, Boston; F. S. Campbell, 50 Rock Avenue, Lynn; Charles Indigaro, East Boston; P. De Stefano, 5 Winthrop Block, East Boston; A. Cangiano, Pemberton Building, Boston; F. L. Browne, 103 Intervale Street, Roxbury; G. Saverino, 492 Commercial Street, Boston; P. Ferrone, 968 Saratoga Street, East Boston; J. Perrone, 968 Saratoga Street, East Boston; M. Gaeti, 122 Prince Street, Boston; J. J. Doherty, 58 Sterling Street, Roxbury; W. A. Aylward, 179 M Street, South Boston; L. Verdi, 240 State Street, Boston; F. W. McKee, 208 Shawmut Avenue, Boston; F. Simons, 296 Washington Street, Boston; F. Flynn, 37 Green Street, Stoughton, Mass.; R. W. Maxwell, 75 Pleasant Street, Boston; N. Zarella, 42a Bennington Street, East Boston; M. Morello, 14 North Square, Boston; F. Carey, 52 Henley Street, Boston; W. Dooey, 58 Tyler Street, Boston; E. M. Norton, 11 Mount Fern Avenue, Revere; L. Cunio, 69 Tremont Street, Boston; W. H. Sloane, 67 Elmwood Street, Revere; T. Cox, 717 Parker Street, Roxbury; H. B. Lincoln, 20 Oak Street, Boston; J. J. Sloane, 402 Meridian Street, East Boston; W. Dolan, 108 Main Street, Everett; G. F. Burton, 744 Broadway, Somerville; H. F. Barry, 38 Brookline Street, Brookline; H. Lockhart, 5 Causeway Street, Boston; E. P. Borden, 19 Third Street, East Cambridge; J. Anthony, Boston, Mass.; H. L. Mason, 464 Massachusetts Avenue, Arlington; J. P. McDonough, 9 Harvard Street, East

Boston; S. Shelbourne, 6 Rollins Place, Boston; F. Manfold, 357 Main Street, Charlestown; J. Hammond, 37 Green Street, Boston; A. Willard, 144 Putnam Street, Boston; D. J. Herney, 357 Fourth Street, South Boston; W. Gerard, 10 Fatten Street, Boston; S. Singer, 49 Porter Street, Boston; J. H. Papineau, 36 Staniford Street, Boston; L. Sybert, 58 Auburn Street, Boston; J. F. Gorman, 152 F Street, South Boston; E. J. Keating, 10 Eaton Street, Boston; W. A. Mack, 382 Hanover Street, Boston; J. J. Doherty, 67 Green Street, Charlestown; J. Kelley, 21 Vernon Park Street, Boston; J. W. Ryan, 37 Jenkins Street, South Boston; L. J. Doherty, 111 Third Street, South Boston; J. P. Leary, 128 High Street, Charlestown; L. Mitchell, 25 Fifth Street, South Boston; A. H. Nodini, Arlington, Mass.; R. C. Christenden, 10 Wilson Avenue, Atlantic, Mass.; E. Vernaick, 43 Millets Street, Dorchester; W. G. Lee, 13 Corning Street, Boston; S. Jones, 19 Pine Street, Boston; W. F. O'Neil, 39 Ashley Street, Boston; W. L. Kerrin, 13 Narriva Street, Boston; G. Corey, Lawrence, Mass.; N. Harris, 72 Crescent Avenue, Boston; J. P. Havlin, 305 Silver Street, South Boston; F. H. Dew, 4 Lawrence Avenue, Charlestown; A. Spadaro, 115, Richmond Street, Boston; M. Gardner, 351 West Elna Street, Brockton, Mass.; B. Gnecco, 97 Fulton Street, Boston; C. Booth, 525 East Sixth Street, South Boston; W. C. Rich, 27 Lincoln Street, Charlestown; E. F. Rich, 25 Avon Place, Arlington; C. Kaufman, 7 Kimball Street, Roxbury; W. Booth Co., Lowell, Mass.; J. F. Dooley, 266 Cottage Street, Dorchester; B. Wright, Everett, Mass.; F. Baldassaro, 22 Thatcher Street, Boston; B. Armstrong, 157 Causeway Street, Boston; W. Armstrong, 157 Causeway Street, Boston; S. Dixvigliio, 165 Endicott Street, Boston; L. Carosi, 137 Endicott Street, Boston; A. Di Napoli, 163 Endicott Street, Boston; O. Christoforo, 13 Thatcher Street, Boston; L. Gillio, 105 North Washington Street, Boston; C. Carbone, 11 Thatcher Street, Boston; T. Arinella, 174 Dana Street, East Boston; O. C. Cook, 37 Thatcher Street, Boston; C. E. Reed, 131 Staniford Street, Boston; C. H. Winter, 467 Dudley Street, Boston; P. Doherty, 327 Medford Street, Charlestown; J. Caprio, 206 Chelsea Street, East Boston; J. Annadora, 144 Prince Street, Boston; P. Carbone, 166 Endicott Street, Boston; P. Anzalone, 216 Endicott Street, Boston; A. J. Cunio, 82 Endicott Street, Boston; J. Cuaranto, 3 Thatcher Street, Boston; P. Devlin, 93 Endicott Street, Boston; F. Russo, 25 Lewis Street, Everett; E. Istoclo, 94 North Margin Street, Boston; W. J. Donwey, 107 Haverhill Street, Boston; M. L. Bacon, 22 Bolster Street, Everett; E. G. Bloom, 780 Beacon Street, Boston; W. Garfield, 2 Alcott Street, Allston; F. Thompson, New Harbor, Me.; D. J. Connor, 26 Tremont Street, Boston; D. Stantjarl, 2 Edgeworth Street, Charlestown; W. Harlein, 197 Endicott Street, Boston; A. Moschelli, 27 Sheaf Street, Boston; J. Lepero, 22 Thatcher Street, Boston; W. E. Redford, 34 Harvard Street, Boston; J. Mastrangelo, 216 Endicott Street, Boston; P. Distacio, 92 North Margin Street, Boston; F. Jacklin, 11 Thatcher Street, Boston; C. Carline, 47 Elmwood Street, Boston; F. J. Jones, Revere, Mass.; J. Armino, 12 Thatcher Street, Boston; F. Bronzo, 79 North Margin Street, Boston; J. Jackson, 17 Thatcher Street, Boston; W. Bevilacqua, 68 North Margin Street, Boston; C. Spagnuolo, 135 Endicott Street, Boston; C. Frezz, 14 Thatcher Street, Boston; J. Doherty, 132 Main Street, Boston; A. Ziari, 13 Gove Street, Boston; T. Scheraffy, 304 Hanover Street, Boston; J. Quarino, 7 Thatcher Street, Boston; M. Esposito, 107 Washington Street, Boston; M. Rocco, 11 Hudson Street, Charlestown; S. S. Rosenthal, 38 McClellan Street, Dorchester; S. A. Frakk, 43 Hollander Street, Roxbury; J. J. Kenney, 10 Myrtle Street, Boston; R. E. McMullan, 76 Temple Avenue, Winthrop; J. J. Hallahan, 35 Allen Street, Boston; S. J. Mahoney, 463 Meridian Street, East Boston; A. A. McLean, 302 Beach Street, Revere; F. H. Wallis, Irvington Street, Boston; J. H. Towne, Stoughton, Mass.; E. A. Heheberger, 462 Norfolk Street, Boston; A. Helmsley, 254 Shawmut Avenue, Boston; Hugh Beaton, Orient Heights, Mass.; J. Murphy, 801 Blue Hill Avenue, Dorchester; W. S. O'Connor, 794 Parker Street, Roxbury; W. H. Doyle, 83 St. Botolph, Boston; J. S. Spargo, Medway, Mass.; H. Harris, Belmont, Mass.; C. N. Morgan, Chelsea, Mass.; F. Allen, Medford, Mass.; E. B. Smith, 46 Maxwell Street, Boston; R. W. O'Neil, Dorchester, Mass.; J. A. McCarthy, Dorchester, Mass.; G. M. Herdman, Needham, Mass.; C. S. Gilman, 450 Massachusetts Avenue, Boston; E. F. Hayward, Dorchester, Mass.; J. J. Murphy, 128 East Cottage Street, Dorchester; J. J. Osborne, 26 Hamilton Street, Boston; J. A. Volpe, Medford, Mass.; W. F. Sherburn, 633 Washington Street, Boston; W. A. Hamilton, 69 Neponset Avenue, Dorchester; J. A. Callahan, 88 Coolidge Street, Brookline; J. W. English, 30 Hewlett Street, Boston; C. J. Hill, 5 Carme Street, Dorchester; H. Edmonds, Concord, Mass.; W. E. Hapgood, Boston, Mass.; J. Strowell, Boston, Mass.; J. F. Kennedy, Providence, R. I.; E. H. Greining, Boston, Mass.; H. F. Wheeler, Boston, Mass.; W. E. Murphy, Boston, Mass.; P. C. O'Brien, Boston, Mass.; A. Santosuosso, Smith Building, Boston; R. Mareta, 980 Saratoga Street, East Boston; A. Loschi, 115 Neptune Street, East Boston; J. L. Capezzoli, Smith Building, Boston; E. V. Leonard, 48 Tremont Street, Boston; A. Lombardini, 36 Ivaloo Street, Somerville; F. Repucci, 12 Garden Street, Boston; F. E. Leveroni, 15 Court Square, Boston; M. Lepori, 485 Revere Street, Revere; J. Garcia, 350 Hanover Street, Boston; B. Leonard, 15 Court Square, Boston; M. L. Maguire, East Boston, Mass.; J. A. Sheehan, 468 Saratoga Street, East Boston; J. A. Di Pesa, Revere, Mass.; A. G. Mocaroli, 6 Prince Street, Boston; F. Cardoli, 347 Hanover Street, Boston; D. Maiani, 3 McClure Street, Revere; S. Bucci, 35 North Bennett Street, Boston; W. Emmons, 14 Summer Street, Charlestown; P. Stevens, 7 Water Street,

Boston; I. Grilli, 23 Howard Street, Boston; F. Carabina, 14 Fulton Street, Boston; H. Sachessl, 193 Maverick Street, East Boston; S. Cassas, 1 Unity Street, Boston; J. A. Cunio, 3 Fulton Place, Boston; M. F. Callish, 54 Fowler Street, Dorchester, Mass.; L. Stroock, 75 Carolina Avenue, Roxbury; D. Lombardo, 302 Summer Street, Boston; P. Caprisco, 29 Richmond Street, Boston; H. L. Mudgett, 31 Richmond Street, Boston; M. Farrell, 364 North Street, Boston; F. L. Henry, 52 Blossom Street, Boston; M. Premoli, 4 Langdon Place, Boston; G. Temerilli, 3 Langdon Place, Boston; C. E. Sheali, 197 Shawmut Avenue, Boston; J. M. Hubbard, 32 Fowland Street, Dorchester; A. L. Poto, 176 North Street, Boston; D. Pallidino, 157 North Street, Boston; L. Fucillo, 157 North Street, Boston; Kanellopoulos Bros., 224 North Street, Boston; N. Colone, 176 North Street, Boston; V. Fergnani, 190 North Street, Boston; F. Pistorino, 190 North Street, Boston; R. Cotechia, 176 North Street, Boston; N. De Bouris, 176 North Street, Boston; J. Pistorino, 152 Jerome Street, West Medford; M. Guidi, 240 Hanover Street, Boston; D. A. Visconti, 610 Washington Avenue, Chelsea; F. Walter, 148 Prince Street, Boston; J. Andy, 49 School Street, Charlestown; J. Donahue, 225 Endicott Street, Boston; R. J. Manfri, 2 Albred Court, Everett; J. H. Johnson, 140 Causeway Street, Boston; W. Nicolini, 69 Kimball Avenue, Revere; C. Finley, 102 Proctor Avenue, Revere; F. Morrill, 259 Shawmut Avenue, Boston; B. Douglas, 146 South Common Street, Lynn; M. Brown, 91 Waverly Avenue, Revere; W. W. Vigston, 49 Pearl Avenue, Revere; J. F. Roach, 15 Walnut Avenue, Revere; B. Farrell, 318 Ocean Avenue, Revere; E. A. Moran, 8 Garfield Avenue, Revere; H. Berkowitch, 481 Beach Street, Revere; H. Carroll, 38 Erwin Street, Winthrop; H. Marshall, 29 Otis Street, Revere; M. Lagan, 24 Shirley Avenue, Revere; N. Prince, 70 Highland Street, Revere; A. D. W. Reid, 44 Garfield Avenue, Revere; J. J. Kerrigan, 126 Walnut Avenue, Revere; D. J. Shaughnessy, 157 Baker Avenue, Revere; J. Reed, 9 Walnut Avenue, Revere; F. Doran, 41 Baker Avenue, Revere; M. Eastman, 6 Bellidere Street, Revere; J. Lane, 199 Shirley Avenue, Revere; F. O'Neill, 9 Auber Street, Boston; J. Doheney, 113 Garfield Avenue, Revere; E. Butler, 61 Kimball Avenue, Revere; F. Nicolini, 91 Kimball Avenue, Revere; E. H. Homer, 114 Main Street, Winthrop; T. F. Harrigan, 52 Pleasant Street, Charlestown; W. Dunzali, 18 Webster Avenue, Boston; F. Guinail, 18 Webster Avenue, Boston; M. Marotta, 4 Langden Place, Boston; M. Lanzilla, 53 Cooper Street, Boston; M. De Angelis, 13 Lewis Street, Boston; J. Daley, 174 Paris Street, East Boston; N. Tadesco, 137 Endicott Street, Boston; J. Forgin, 166 Prince Street, Boston; F. Minegall, 99a Prince Street, Boston; J. Mastono, 216 Endicott Street, Boston; F. Forgioli, 166 Prince Street, Boston; E. Tremost, 156 Cottage Street, Boston; W. W. and C. R. Noyes, Boston, Mass.; A. Y. Nickerson, Fall River, Mass.; M. A. Gensenhiser, Somerville, Mass.; Almeda Eames & Co., Boston, Mass.; W. S. Littlefield, Boston, Mass.; D. F. Littlefield, Saco, Me.; John B. Valente, Boston, Mass.; G. O. Carpenter, Boston, Mass.; Francis Batchelder, Boston, Mass.; Edwin A. Hilton, Boston, Mass.; J. E. Hill & Co., Brockton, Mass.; E. H. McCourtland, Malden, Mass.; H. E. Corson, Somerville, Mass.; Oakley W. Alden, Boston, Mass.; E. A. Harris, Boston, Mass.; Charles S. Eustis, Somerville, Mass.; J. T. Wyman, Boston, Mass.; Lucius C. Smith, South Market Street, Boston, Mass.; Henry R. Wyman, Lynn, Mass.; John J. Lane, Arlington, Mass.; Arthur Miller, 46 Clinton Street, Boston; Horace Waite, Winthrop, Mass.; Perley F. Sturgis, Melrose, Mass.; Jesse C. Snow, Roxbury, Mass.; C. Henry Kimball, Gloucester, Mass.; S. M. Bartlett, Boston, Mass.; Charles A. Keyes, Boston, Mass.; Brown D. Loria Co., Boston, Mass.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I am opposed to the principle involved in imposing this tax. Removing the duty from food products produced in this country and making up the loss in revenue by imposing a duty on a similar food product which is not produced in this country is directly contrary to such political principles as I have bearing on the tariff; and it is on that subject that I want briefly to address the Senate.

This is not a protective duty in any sense, as has been stated by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], because bananas can not be produced in the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to remind the Senator from Massachusetts that in portions of the territory belonging to the United States bananas are produced. They are grown in Porto Rico and in Hawaii, and form a part of the imports of both those countries to the continent.

Mr. WEEKS. I was referring, of course, to continental United States. While there are some bananas produced in Porto Rico, they are limited in number. There are comparatively few produced in Hawaii.

The islands of the Caribbean are not alike in their capacity to produce bananas. Those which are brought into this country are the large bunches, containing from seven to nine hands, or perhaps 100 bananas to a bunch. It has been determined by experiments made that certain sections of some of the islands of the Caribbean do not produce bananas of that kind. The United Fruit Co., to which the Senator from Mississippi has

referred, devoted between one and two millions of dollars to trying to produce bananas in Cuba. There are some bananas produced there; but this company finally gave up the attempt, believing that bananas could not be produced there successfully, and not desiring to attempt to import bunches of bananas containing less than seven hands, because it was believed then and is now that they could not be imported successfully in competition with larger bunches.

As I have said, there is no protection involved in this duty, so far as continental United States is concerned. The banana plant, or tree, is a very tender plant, and all attempts made to produce them in Florida have failed, the tree being killed or damaged by the slightest frost.

Neither is the banana a luxury, as has been suggested by the Senator from Mississippi. It is an important food product in general use, and is especially popular among people of very moderate means in large cities.

It may be of interest to note what has been the result of the development of the banana business in the United States. It is only about 40 years since the captain of a trading schooner brought a few bunches of bananas from Jamaica to Boston as an experiment. Last year there were brought into this country more than 44,000,000 bunches of bananas, equal to about 60 bananas for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

If anyone will take the trouble to go into the sections of the city where those having the smallest resources live, especially in sections occupied by those of foreign birth, he will see all classes and all ages of those people eating bananas, and to a large extent it is the basic food on which they depend. It is so immeasurably cheaper than any other food of similar character that they can afford to buy the banana when they could not afford other fruits.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] a few moments ago made some remarks about apples and the relative value of apples and bananas. Why, a pound of bananas has substantially the same fuel value per pound (calories) that a pound of apples has; and yet you can go anywhere on the street and buy 3 pounds of bananas for what you must pay for a pound of apples, raised in any part of the United States. As an economical food product they are not in the same class. The banana is so much cheaper.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, may I be allowed to interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. LANE. If the fruit section of the Pacific coast is allowed free access to the Atlantic coast, with cheap transportation, it can flood the Atlantic coast with all the fruit the people will consume. I wish to assure the Senator that good apples are fully as healthful as bananas. There is a question raised by many physicians as to the desirability of bananas as a food for children. If the banana is eaten in its native country, ripened by natural processes, I think it is a good food for children, for the reason that the starch has undergone a change toward the formation of sugar in a normal manner. But many bananas, as they are handled in this country, where the ripening is forced by artificial means, are not good for children; and it is a question whether in many cases they do not do a great deal of harm. I think if the Senator will leave out that part of his argument he will be on safer ground, for it is just possible that a good many children have been killed by eating very bad and poor bananas, while if they had eaten the good old Oregon and Washington apples they would not have suffered that fate.

Mr. SMOOT. They could not afford them.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I think as many children have been given the stomach ache by eating green apples as by eating bananas. In any case, the Senator from Oregon does not want to get the idea that all the apples grown in the United States are raised in Oregon. The Senator from Arkansas would tell us that the best apples in the United States are raised in Arkansas; or the Senator from Virginia would tell us that the best apples in the United States are raised just across the line, in Virginia.

Mr. GALLINGER. And I would tell the Senator that the best apple is raised in New England.

Mr. WEEKS. Of course. [Laughter.]

Mr. OVERMAN. I believe North Carolina got the prize. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. In order that there may not be anything selfish about this production I wish to say that New Jersey is quite prominent. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I am willing to admit that New Jersey excels in applejack, if not in apples.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. We have the apples to make the best applejack.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator from Mississippi has said something about the price to the consumer. It is the first time I

have ever heard a Democrat in a position of responsibility make the statement that a tariff tax was not paid by the consumer. I do not know exactly who will pay this tax. I do not think anybody knows exactly who will pay it, but somebody is going to pay about two and one-quarter million dollars, and I suspect it will be the consumer in this case.

The majority of the Senate committee at first proposed to impose a duty of 5 cents a bunch. Then, finding there was a great variation in the size of bunches, they changed it to one-tenth of 1 cent a pound, a bad step, in my opinion, because it imposes a weighing of the bunches, causing an additional handling of the fruit, from which more or less damage will be done, especially to the best fruit. But the amount of revenue raised will be substantially the same in either case, for a bunch of bananas of 9 hands weighs between 50 and 75 pounds, and a bunch of 7 to 8 hands weighs between 25 and 50 pounds. If the average weight is 50 pounds, the duty will be exactly the same as that originally contemplated.

Bananas are brought from the place where grown and are sold by the transportation company to jobbers. If a tax of 5 cents a bunch is imposed, it follows that the company transporting the bananas is going to charge the jobber 5 cents a bunch more than it would if it did not have to pay the duty.

The jobber sells the bananas to the retailer, and it is more than likely that the duty which the jobber has paid will be passed along when this transfer is made. The retailer sells the bananas by the dozen, or sometimes, of course, by the piece, but in any case the retailer will have to distribute that duty, and those who use the bananas will pay the two and one-quarter million dollars which this duty will produce; quite likely they will pay more than that, for it will not be easy to charge exactly enough additional to make the difference, and the tendency will be to increase the retail price so that there may be no possibility of loss to the retailer, thereby increasing his profits.

But it is not for the purpose of protection, and it is not for the purpose of reducing the cost of living, and it is not for the reason that bananas are not a food product, and it is not for the purpose of raising revenue that this duty is being imposed; the duty is really being imposed because Senators on the other side think they have discovered a trust in the shape of the United Fruit Co., to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred.

Some days ago the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Bristow], in referring to the duty on bananas, brought forth from the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] the statement that he was not responsible for this duty; that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] was responsible for it. That suggestion led me to investigate, and I found some remarks on this subject made by the Senator from Oklahoma four years ago, when the Payne-Aldrich bill was under discussion. At that time Senator GORE announced that he had discovered a trust, and to punish it he proposed a duty of 6 cents a bunch on bananas. He used this language:

Mr. President, I think I have treed a trust.

Then he goes on to make statements about the United Fruit Co. There was, of course, a modicum of fact in what he said, but much of his statement indicated that some one had imposed on his credulity, for the facts did not then and do not now accord with his statement.

It is of importance to determine whether a monopoly is controlling this industry, even though it is not operating in the United States, and whether it is extorting unreasonable prices from those who use the fruit, and in order to arrive at a correct conclusion it is necessary to refer in some detail to the operations of the United Fruit Co. and point out its relations to this trade. In doing this I think it will be demonstrated that there is the most active competition in the banana industry; that the consumer gets the fruit at a reasonable price; that the profits are not large, but both price and profit are dependent upon the crop and other conditions which apply to every similar industry; that the operation of the United Fruit Co. is relatively gaining so that there is not only now but is likely to be in the future sufficient competition, and that in any case it is not the kind of trust the Senator from Oklahoma evidently had in his mind, and I think there may be seen some things in connection with the operations of the United Fruit Co., which will appeal even to a Democratic Senator.

This company was organized in 1900 by combining a dozen companies, among them the Boston Fruit Co., with an authorized capital of \$20,000,000, and capital issued for the purposes of the combination of \$11,230,000. Since that time in extending the business of the company and entirely for assets as the result of the expenditures, the capital has been increased to \$36,594,300. Indeed, the assets have increased more rapidly than the capital, so that dividends are not being paid on water but on actual capital paid in.

The object in establishing this company was to raise fruit and sugar and to transport them to a market, and in carrying

out these purposes the company has been successful; it has been and is now paying good dividends on its stock—I think 8 per cent at this time—and it has developed one of the largest farming industries in the world. But this development has not been at the expense of others, as has been intimated by the Senator from Mississippi, but has been done along natural and proper lines, benefiting a large number of people connected with the industry in many different ways and indirectly great numbers of people in other ways, including those who consume the fruit.

As an evidence of the development of the industry since 1900 it is only necessary to state that at that time there were brought into this country 16,000,000 bunches of bananas, and in the 13 years this quantity has increased to 44,000,000 bunches, and to show in making this increase that the United Fruit Co. has not developed a monopoly it is needless to make any other statement than that of the 16,000,000 bunches brought into the United States in 1900, the United Fruit Co. transported 11,000,000 and other companies 5,000,000. Last year the United Fruit Co. brought in 25,000,000 bunches, while other companies brought in 17,000,000; in other words, the fruit transported by the United Fruit Co. had increased in the 13 years 125 per cent, while that transported by the 20 other companies in operation, had increased 240 per cent. This increase has been brought about without increasing the price of bananas to the retailer or to the consumer.

I submit herewith a statement of the average annual prices obtained for bananas during the operations of the United Fruit Co., which shows that the highest wholesale price per stem during this period has been \$1.048; the lowest price, \$0.815; the average price, \$0.931, and, curiously enough, that is exactly the price obtained last year:

Nine-hand bunch, jobbers' price:		
1900	\$0.866
1901815
190294
1903916
1904931
1905828
190697
1907	1.039
1908958
1909908
1910	1.048
1911954
1912931

Therefore, while the cost of foods in the United States during this period has increased 24 per cent, the cost of bananas to the consumer has not increased a cent, and, as I have just stated, the United Fruit Co.'s part in the production and the transportation of bananas has not increased one-half as rapidly as the increase of the 20 other companies which are in competition with it.

Incidentally, it may be mentioned that the United Fruit Co. is a home corporation; I believe its stock is entirely owned by citizens of the United States, while the opposition companies are very largely controlled by foreigners, and I am told that the strongest opposition is entirely within foreign control. As an evidence of the widespread financial interest in this company and as an indication of the fact that it is not owned or controlled by a few men, I submit a statement showing the holders of the stock in the United Fruit Co. at the time of the consolidation and each year since; also the number of trustees who are holders of stock and the shares held by them; the number of women who are owners of stock and the number of shares held by them:

Number of stockholders in the United Fruit Co. and the increase from year to year since its organization.

Date.	Number.	Increase.
September, 1899	361	361
September, 1900	971	610
September, 1901	1,608	637
September, 1902	1,643	35
September, 1903	1,865	222
September, 1904	2,314	449
September, 1905	3,232	918
September, 1906	3,778	546
September, 1907	5,122	1,344
September, 1908	5,908	786
September, 1909	6,169	262
September, 1910	6,181	21
September, 1911	6,653	472
September, 1912	7,104	446
June, 1913	7,555	451
		7,555

Number of stockholders who were trustees on June 26, 1913, 239; percentage of total, 4.48.

Number of stockholders who were women on June 26, 1913, 3,794; percentage of total, 50.2.

Proportion of the stock held by trustees June 26, 1913: Number of shares, 23,786; percentage of total, 6.5.

Proportion of the stock held by women June 26, 1913: Number of shares, 97,262; percentage of total, 28.57.

It will be noticed that there has been a very wide distribution of the capital since the organization of the company, and that in number more than one-half of the stockholders are women, and that trustees have a considerable holding, which shows the estimation in which the management and operation of the company are held by those who are familiar with it.

It has been charged that there is an extremely large profit made in the producing and bringing bananas to the United States. All the testimony that has been submitted indicates that this surmise is not true, and as evidence in favor of this contention I submit a circular issued by the Atlantic Fruit Co., of 11 Broadway, New York City, under date of June 23, 1913, in which they contend that profits are extremely small, and that while the Atlantic Fruit Co. is an important element in this trade it can not compete with the United Fruit Co. if the duty in question is imposed. I quote a paragraph giving their statement as to profits obtained in this trade during recent years:

It may be argued against our contention that the United Fruit Co. is abundantly able to stand the tax and will have to do so, and that other companies should be in the same position, but against this our figures will show that on the importations of this company from October, 1905, to September 30, 1910, profits shown were only 2.7 cents per bunch; and from September 30, 1910, to December 31, 1912, a loss of 2 cents per bunch; and from January 1, 1913, to May 31, 1913, a loss of 6.3 cents per bunch; although as to the latter item, which includes the winter months, when all companies must face a certain loss, the remainder of the fiscal year may bring the year's showing to approximately 2.5 cents profit per bunch.

If this statement is correct, of course it necessarily means that either the smaller companies will go out of business or the price of bananas to the consumer will be increased.

The operations of the United Fruit Co. are not confined to the raising and transporting of bananas, but are extended to the transporting of other fruits and to the production of sugar, of which 144,000,000 pounds were produced last year. This has not been done by absorbing or purchasing other companies, but by a business built up by the United Fruit Co. itself.

The operations of this company, of course conducted presumably for its benefit, have inured indirectly to the advantage of the whole Caribbean district in many ways. It has constructed hospitals in various countries at a cost of over \$300,000, in the maintenance of which it spent last year \$240,000. During the life of the company there have been treated in these hospitals 63,000 patients, more than 25 per cent of whom were not employees of the company. During the past year, as a result of the health service installed by this company, not a single case of any disease subject to quarantine appeared in any port in which the company is engaged in business, as a result of its operations, nor on any of its ships in the service. It has established an extensive wireless-telegraph system covering the Caribbean Sea region, and has constructed lighthouses at many points, which are not only of benefit to itself but to commerce in general. Incidentally, it has largely affected our commerce in the field in which it operates. During the first year of the company's business it exported to foreign countries, for use in connection with its own affairs, \$754,506 worth of merchandise purchased in the United States, while last year, for the same purpose, it exported \$4,020,000 worth. But this is only a small item compared with the business which has been very largely developed through the means of transportation and as the result of the operations of the United Fruit Co. For instance, the exports to the West Indies and Central America from the port of New Orleans during this period show an enormous increase, much of which is due to the direct line of steamers operated by this company. The following is a statement of these exports:

Exports to the West Indies and Central America from New Orleans.

Country.	1900	1911
British Honduras.....	\$244,247	\$1,266,320
Guatemala.....	58,243	862,746
Spanish Honduras.....	403,828	1,205,668
Nicaragua.....	936,825	904,837
Costa Rica.....	354,209	993,190
Panama.....		3,616,668
Mexico.....	595,044	3,826,534
Cuba.....	1,817,583	5,223,695
Total.....	4,410,139	17,909,658

In other words, from New Orleans alone, in 11 years, these exports have increased 300 per cent, and if such results are obtained from other ports touched by the United Fruit Co. it seems that an enormous volume of manufactures and agricultural products in the United States have found a new market in the Caribbean district, and this traffic does not inure alone to the benefit of the transportation line itself, but indirectly affects local traffic in the United States. As an example of this, there

were transported by rail to inland points in the United States freight, which originated within the operations of the United Fruit Co., aggregating 583,500 tons, a necessarily valuable business to the railroads and probably reducing the rates charged on goods brought from inland to the seaboard, because a lower rate can be made in cases where cars go loaded both ways than in cases where the cars must be returned empty to their starting point.

The development of the company has meant the building of many steamers and an increase of its transportation facilities commensurate with the increased resources of the company and the business which it carries on. During the first year of the company's business the largest ship employed in connection with its business had a capacity of about 2,000 tons, and most of the vessels employed in the service at that time were foreign steamers chartered by the company. Since then the company has built 20 steamships, having a total tonnage of 117,252 tons, the largest having a capacity of 8,000 tons. This is of great importance to our people, because it means employment for those engaged in shipbuilding and ship repairing, and it would give us the possibility of obtaining valuable auxiliaries in case of war. In 1898 the country was greatly disturbed in obtaining sufficient steamers for the comparatively small transportation service required at that time. Since then the United Fruit Co. has built and put in operation more steamers than all other similar transportation companies put together, and if we are going to take steps to rehabilitate our merchant marine, which I believe will be done in the near future, it is a pretty poor way to commence it by crippling the one company which has been adding to our transportation facilities, even under the present conditions. If we put a duty of 5 cents a bunch on bananas—there being no duty in most European countries—it will, in my judgment, change the trend of banana shipments away from the United States to those countries. It is true that the countries of Europe have not increased their use of bananas in the same proportion that the increase has been developed in the United States, but it is evident that the trade in Europe will in the near future make the same or similar advances that have been made in the United States, and if we impose this duty it will accelerate this increase at our expense. With this increased demand in Europe the steamers carrying the bananas, in order to make their calling more profitable, will offer unusual facilities for the transportation of goods in return, so that the sales of European goods will be increased as transportation lines are established and as a result of the development of the banana traffic. The net result of this would be that we in this country not only will lose the bananas, which will necessarily affect food prices in other cases, but we will also lose the sale of goods which will be imported from Europe to take the place of those which otherwise would come from this country.

It seems to me that all of this shows that the operations of the United Fruit Co. have been beneficial not only to the 7,500 stockholders and the 40,000 employees of the company, but to all of the people in the United States, and that an attempt to cripple this company by the imposition of this duty is not only an unreasonable proceeding in itself, but that it will fail of its purpose, for the United Fruit Co., being a producer as well as a transporter and having large interests in the localities where the best bananas are produced, can operate on terms which mean annihilation to the competition of smaller companies. So we have the spectacle of the Democratic majority in the Senate being willing to put a duty on a food product, used very largely by people of extremely moderate means, for the purpose of punishing a corporation which any unprejudiced individual must admit has been beneficial to American interests. But even this attempt, in my judgment, will fail in its purpose, for there is every reason to believe that the smaller companies will feel the result of the duty much more keenly than the larger company, so that competition instead of being increased will be destroyed and the larger company will be able, if it desires to do so, to increase the cost of bananas to the American consumer to its own benefit.

I can not believe that the large number of those who protest against this duty and others who are advised of the contemplated action will submit without still further protest to this ill-advised attempt to restrict American enterprise, which must result, if it succeeds, in increasing the cost of an important food.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, one of the statements made in the report of the majority of the Committee on Finance of the Senate says:

A small revenue tax on this article was deemed justifiable—

Referring to bananas—

in view of the fact that the importation of bananas to this country is a practical monopoly of the United Fruit Co. On account of the perishable nature of bananas and the smallness of the tax, it is not believed it can be readily shifted to the ultimate consumer.

In order to test the application of the statement made in the committee report, I found it advisable to investigate the time that a bunch of bananas requires to come from Costa Rica into the grocery shop in Washington or Chicago. It takes two weeks from the time it is cut from the banana tree, put on the local railroad back in the plantation in Costa Rica, and the hoisting machinery puts it down in the United Fruit Co.'s steamer until it is hanging up in the grocery in Chicago or in the States of the Middle West.

The modern plan of transportation of this perishable product has entirely changed the method of transacting the business. There is a refrigeration in the steamer bringing that product to our shores that is practically perfect. It is equal to that of any refrigerator car that travels on the continental lines of railway.

Therefore there is no protection, as a perishable commodity, against shifting this 10 cents a hundred pounds to the consumer of the article. There is no competition by the protection of a like product in this country. Porto Rico does not, commercially speaking, put anything on the market that affects the supply; neither does Hawaii. There is not anything which comes to the Pacific coast that materially affects the market of this product unless from Central America or the Caribbean Sea country. There is nothing raised inside the limits of continental United States. There is but little in Mexico. You do not strike the banana belt until you get way into south Mexico. You have to take a steamer from Vera Cruz, if you are on land, and go around to get into the banana country.

Practically, therefore, what is claimed by those who believe in the doctrine of encouraging and developing something we can produce here does not and could not apply to bananas. There are not enough bananas raised in the United States or in the country that is subject to its jurisdiction practically to feed the animals in the zoological gardens that are maintained in this country. In other words, the market is not appreciably affected by the home production. It is supplied by the plantations in south Mexico, in Costa Rica, in Honduras, in Colombia, in the northern part of South America, and a few other countries near there.

Jamaica is a British colony. Our relations are not only friendly with the home Government of Jamaica and the local business interests that is handling the banana product in Jamaica, but it is friendly with all the Caribbean Sea country. Of course, that is not important. What our relations may be with the Central or West Indian countries is not of much consequence. We are not out of the Government receivership in San Domingo yet. It is not of much consequence. It may be dismissed, notwithstanding the fact that we have either to vitalize the Monroe doctrine in the Western Hemisphere or we have to ignobly and meanly abandon it. It is of no importance what our relations are with the Central or South American Republics. It is of no consequence what are our relations with Mexico until some Senator on this side of the Chamber introduces a resolution, and then there is a most astounding and consuming interest manifested, and we restrain ourselves; and I am willing to do so.

But when it is said here that our commercial relations with Central America are of no consequence it is well to remember that under the Monroe doctrine we must exercise some sort of supervisory power over many of those countries or abandon it. Now I think is a good time to begin to cultivate amicable relations with the principal product many of them send to a friendly port. I do not want to discuss that branch of it at this time; it may become proper some other time.

There is one matter that I think is material here. A great many of the tropical countries exporting to us their products have seen fit to impose an export duty.

In every instance the South American Governments will learn this in time. If you talk with them when traveling in those countries, you will find that they are gradually beginning to discover how to extract revenue from other countries from their products we use but can not produce. They know that everybody who drinks a cup of coffee made from Brazilian coffee is paying tribute to that country. Costa Rica on the 1st day of July, 1910, put an export duty on bananas. There is an export duty of 1 cent gold on every bunch of bananas that goes out of that country. That export duty lasts until July, 1930. You can figure upon twelve and fourteen million bunches that come from Costa Rica alone just about how much revenue they will make, which either the United Fruit Co. will pay or the purchasers of bananas will pay; somebody must pay it. Costa Rica gets the revenue, and the United Fruit Co. and the independent companies, if you call it a trust, are engaged in the pleasing occupation of contributing to the public revenues of the Government of Costa Rica.

If you go to South America, what do you find? You skirt around the coast and you get to Colombia. You will find our heavy machinery there; you will find our flour and our salted meats there; you will find there the cheeses that are made here that are imperishable and gain strength every day in the Tropics; but little outside of that, hardly. You find our trade in other lines diminishing, if we ever had it, and you find the German and the Englishman selling in that market.

If you investigate a little further you will find that in this year, 1913, Germans have gone into Colombia and bought up large bodies of the available banana lands, and this year, 1913, is their first crop. They have organized a line of steamships, and in this year, 1913, that line of steamships is carrying out of that country that first crop of bananas grown from the trees that were planted long enough ago to produce it. So that this year's crop is the first they have sent to the European market. That is a German company.

You will find, if you go a little further, that about 1900—I am quoting from memory—Englishmen organized a line of freight boats to Jamaica. If you look back of that organization, you will find that, like most of the English steamship lines, it is a subsidized line, and under the guise of carrying the Royal mails, it is a subsidized freight boat that goes to Jamaica and takes the bananas back to the home country.

If we investigate the exports from Jamaica into the English market we find that Great Britain is the second of the countries in the world in the consumption of bananas, the United States being first.

A little after this freight-boat line was established, a second one was established, and is now plying its craft between the West India ports and the home country.

About two or three weeks ago dispatches came here from that country to the effect that England is preparing to fortify one of her West India islands, putting there many thousands of pounds sterling in the improvement of her harbors, in strengthening her coast defenses, and in establishing an adequate coaling station for her navy in that part of the world. So far as the public peace is concerned it is a friendly undertaking on her part; no hostility toward this country is manifested in that development, but she is simply preparing for the coming change.

When the Isthmian Canal is opened the great trade routes of the world will be changed, the line of travel by shipping will be deflected from present courses, and Great Britain, with her foresight, with her subsidies to her boats that travel world-wide, is preparing herself for the change that will come in the transportation of persons and property through the Isthmian Canal. When that time comes, with an import duty on 45,000,000 bunches of bananas entering our market they can send their products in Costa Rica and in northern South America and the rest of the Caribbean country to some other places, because the market is increasing daily.

I do not regard a banana as a luxury; but I regard an Oregon apple as a luxury. In some parts of our Mississippi Valley country we have had to draw our supply from the Pacific coast—those of us who are inclined to be of fruit-eating habits. I am not much of a meat eater, but am a good deal of a vegetarian, and I take great pleasure in paying from 5 cents apiece to six for a quarter for apples that come from the Pacific coast. I have no objection to that, for they are fine apples, and they are worth the money.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I should like to explain to the Senator from Illinois that the reason for his paying so high a price for apples is due to the cost of transportation from the Pacific coast. What I say applies pretty generally to the State of Washington, to northern California, to Arizona, and to New Mexico. The high price of apples in Illinois and on the Atlantic coast is on account of the transportation charges to those sections. In our region thousands of bushels of good apples are allowed to lie upon the ground and are not picked for the reason that it does not pay to ship them. You can buy them in that country at any price you desire, but if we had the means of transportation cheaply to this coast, as we shall have when the Panama Canal is opened, we could furnish you apples at a rate which would compete with bananas. Here is one article which ought to please you immensely, for the reason that it brings in a revenue to the Government and incidentally gives you an opportunity to protect the American farmer.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the explanation is entirely reasonable and it is entirely satisfactory; but we raise bananas in no place in continental United States, while we raise apples

in nearly every State here. The apple is peculiarly an American fruit. If it is not raised where it used to be—in the New England States—as much as it was formerly, it is because we have neglected the care of the orchard. That is also true with other places. There is hardly a locality in the United States that will not raise apples if the orchard is cared for. Consequently what applies to apples does not apply to bananas.

It has been stated here, and it is true, that the banana is not a home production—that the principle of protection could never apply to it.

I, too, Mr. President, have a number of communications from gentlemen in various parts of the United States. I will say for the information as well as for the peace of mind of those concerned that I have had no communication of any kind from the United Fruit Co.—not even a circular letter. The communications I have received are from some of my constituents, among whom there are many sons of Italy and many who come from Greece, famed in the classics. They have with one accord unanimously sent me many petitions not to interfere with their usual occupation in furnishing the population with bananas. They know what is the matter; they are in the retail fruit business. They are not in it to make fortunes; they are in it to make a living. But they know just as well as anybody knows that if \$2,250,000 of duties are collected at the ports of New Orleans, Mobile, Baltimore, Boston, and New York—and when I name those ports I name pretty nearly all the ports to which bananas are shipped in this country—they know that when that amount is collected the charge will be passed along on the bunch until finally the man with the pushcart pays the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not remember whether the Senator has mentioned the fact that not only will the amount of this duty be passed on to the ultimate consumer, but the expense of weighing the bananas and the loss that will come by bruising, due to extra handling and in many other ways, will be added and will ultimately fall upon the consumer.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir; it will be just the same as in every other case.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has suggested that this duty will be passed on to the consumer. I suppose that is true of all duties, is it not?

Mr. SMOOT. On articles not produced in this country.

Mr. SHERMAN. That depends. Name the article and then I will answer your question.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is true of many articles upon which the Republican Party has levied duties, is it not?

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator should state a specific article. That is not a question that can be answered except in relation to some specific article in a paragraph or schedule.

Mr. SIMMONS. I find that when Senators on the other side are opposed to a duty and want an article put on the free list they say the duty will be passed on to the consumer, but when they are in favor of a duty they say the duty will not be paid by the consumer.

Mr. SHERMAN. That depends entirely on whether we can produce enough of the article here in this country to supply the domestic consumption. If the Senator will offer the evidence that we can supply our domestic consumption of bananas by some form of culture, it would be a different matter.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator has been arguing for some time as if the duty were placed upon bananas for the purpose of protection; and, with that in view, he has been trying to show that we do not produce any of this article in continental America, although it may be produced in several of our dependencies. I want to say to the Senator that we do not impose this duty with any idea whatsoever of protection. Our sole purpose in proposing the levying of this duty was revenue.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I never had the remotest suspicion that anything like that lurked in the minds of the authors of this bill when they wrote it. The first time I read it I had some suspicion of my own that it was drawn for other purposes. I would not consume time by saying to the Senator from North Carolina that I thought he had any idea of protection in levying this duty on some other articles which we either have considered or will consider.

I only wish to say that if the United Fruit Co. will pay out of its treasury this two million and a quarter dollars and the consumer of the banana will not pay it, although we do not produce any bananas in this country, it is pertinent here to ascertain why the manufacturer of cast-iron pipe can not have applied to him the same kind of a rule. Why should not it apply also to the agricultural-implement manufacturers at Moline and else-

where, together with the branches of the International Harvester Co.'s world-wide business? Why not tax their product? Agricultural implements are one of the shining lights in the writing of this bill, because the farmer gets them free listed, and he is supposed to be correspondingly benefited, as well as the municipalities needing gas and water are correspondingly supposed to be benefited by the free listing of cast-iron pipe; but when it comes to bananas, of which we do not produce any appreciable quantity in this country, there is a different rule followed. If it works in one case, it seems to me that it ought to work in another case.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator really think that a duty of one-tenth of a cent a pound on bananas will be passed on to the consumer—and by the "consumer," I mean the person who eats them—does the Senator think that?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; the consumer will pay the tax in this instance.

Mr. SIMMONS. This is a duty of one-tenth of a cent a pound. My understanding is that it takes about five bananas to weigh a pound, and that bananas are sold in bunches of about five for 5 cents. A bunch of five bananas would pay, therefore, one-tenth of a cent a pound. How would they pass that one-tenth of a cent a pound on to the man who buys five bananas?

Mr. SHERMAN. By raising the price about a nickel.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator think they would add a cent to each banana?

Mr. SHERMAN. That is the usual course, as we know from experience. I can answer that. We endeavored to cheapen shoes in 1909 by free-listing hides—

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator thinks that when the seller here has to pay a tax of one-tenth of a cent and comes to pass that on to the consumer, he multiplies it by 10 and makes it 1 cent?

Mr. SHERMAN. Not necessarily; but he multiplies it enough to get even change.

Mr. SIMMONS. I merely wanted to know how much they pass on to the consumer. I wanted to know whether they really pass on the tax that is paid. The Senator says that if the dealer pays one-tenth of a cent on a bunch of five bananas, worth 5 cents, he will charge the consumer a cent, because he has had to pay one-tenth of a cent; and I want to know if that is the way protection works in the United States.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will explain to the Senator how it works. Ordinarily we buy bananas by the dozen; at least, most folks do. We do not buy them one at a time. We buy them for so much a dozen, and ordinarily when there is a change of this kind the dealers pass along enough of the added charge to make even change.

Mr. SIMMONS. But the Senator has just said that they would pass along ten times the tax in this particular case.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, I do not care how much you figure it out, whether it is five times or ten times. Let me ask the Senator a question. I would not like to have the Senator go. I will be lonesome if the Senator leaves the Chamber.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am very sorry for the Senator, because if that be true, I will say to the Senator that the Senate is very seldom lonesome in these days when the Senator is present.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am glad to know that I relieve the ennui of the occasion. How much does the Senator think the free listing of wheat and flour will diminish the price of a loaf of bread?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not calculated.

Mr. SHERMAN. Well, I have.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, the Senator can answer his own question.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; I can answer the question. It will diminish it three sixty-fourths of a cent in Chicago and ten sixty-fourths of a cent in New York.

Mr. SIMMONS. It will, then, diminish it?

Mr. SHERMAN. That is figured out by millers and bakers in whom I have some confidence. I never knew them to mislead me in regard to anything. I should like to know whether the free listing of flour will result in any corresponding cheapening of the loaf of bread.

I said something about shoes a while ago. When hides were free listed and the duty on shoes was reduced, as I remember—I am quoting from memory—60 per cent, or from 25 per cent down to 10 per cent, the only result of that reduction was that the jobber—not necessarily the manufacturer, but the jobber and the retailer—absorbed the diminished cost themselves. We did not get any benefit of it. That is the way free listing works.

Adding a tax to bananas works just the opposite way, because the other fellow is paying it. The tax is paid by the fruit company in the first instance, the shipper, the importer to this country, if we put it that way. Instead of paying it out of their

corporate treasury, the easiest thing in the world is for them to pass it along. They do not absorb it as they do where an article now taxed is free listed. Shoes that formerly cost \$6 cost \$6.50 now. If you are wearing that kind of a shoe, you got nothing out of that. Bananas, when the duty of more than \$2,000,000 is paid, will have that much of an additional burden put on them, and the men that buy them for their families are the ones that will pay it. That is the usual result all the way through.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. BURTON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRYAN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. LANE (when Mr. CHAMBERLAIN's name was called). I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is unavoidably absent, and that he is paired with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). Announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. KERN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. POINDEXTER's name was called). I am requested to announce that the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] is necessarily absent from the Chamber. He is paired with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when Mr. STONE's name was called). I wish to announce the necessary absence from the Chamber this afternoon of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I will let this announcement stand for all roll calls of the afternoon.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I again announce the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is temporarily absent from the Chamber. I understand he is paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BRYAN. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] is paired with the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I desire to make the same announcement that I made before. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], and will allow my vote to stand. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I inquire if the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am paired with that Senator. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will allow my vote to stand as originally recorded. The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—31.

Ashurst	Kern	Reed	Swanson
Bacon	Lane	Robinson	Thomas
Bankhead	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Thompson
Bryan	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Tillman
Fletcher	Myers	Shively	Vardaman
Hollis	Overman	Simmons	Walsh
Hughes	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
James	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.	

NAYS—28.

Brady	Dillingham	Lodge	Sherman
Brandegge	Fall	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Bristow	Gallinger	Nelson	Smoot
Burton	Gronna	Norris	Sterling
Catron	Jones	Page	Thornton
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Perkins	Warren
Crawford	La Follette	Ransdell	Weeks

NOT VOTING—36.

Borah	Cummins	Lipplitt	Saulsbury
Bradley	du Pont	McCumber	Shields
Burleigh	Goff	Newlands	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Gore	O'Gorman	Smith, Md.
Chilton	Hitchcock	Oliver	Stephenson
Clapp	Jackson	Owen	Stone
Clarke, Ark.	Johnson	Penrose	Sutherland
Colt	Lea	Poindexter	Townsend
Culberson	Lewis	Root	Works

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 233, page 62, line 18, after the word "section," to strike out "15" and insert "10," so as to read:

233. Extract of meat, not specially provided for in this section, 10 cents per pound.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, have we passed paragraph 232?

The VICE PRESIDENT. We have. It has been passed.

Mr. SMOOT. I was engaged in talking with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and it was passed before my attention was called to it.

I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to paragraph 232, which provides for venison and other game a duty of 1½ cents per pound, and for game birds, dressed, a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem. This paragraph levies a duty on venison and game birds, while paragraph 234 levies a duty on dead poultry. Nevertheless, these articles if prepared or preserved would be apparently free of duty under paragraph 548 of the free list, which covers "meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved."

Mr. THOMAS. "Not specially provided for in this section."

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly aware that it says "not specially provided for," and they are not specially provided for in this paragraph. In other words, game birds, dressed, and dead poultry are dutiable under this bill; but if the same articles are prepared or preserved in any manner, they come in free of duty. That is to say, the meat of ducks, whether salted, dried, or packed in tins, comes in free of duty. Was that the intention of the committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What?

Mr. SMOOT. To impose a duty on wild ducks and dead poultry, and at the same time to allow them to come in here free if prepared or preserved in any manner? I call the Senator's attention to paragraph 548 of the free list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Paragraphs 232, 234, and 548?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At first blush I see no clash between them. The first one refers to venison and other game, or, as far as this particular discussion is concerned, it refers to game birds, dressed, and imposes a duty of 30 per cent. Paragraph 234 refers to poultry.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is certainly no trouble in discovering the difference between poultry, domestic fowl, and game birds.

Mr. SMOOT. None at all. That is not the conflict.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is dutiable at 2 cents a pound. Paragraph 548 refers to "Meats: Fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork; bacon and hams; meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for in this section."

Mr. SMOOT. That is true, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Poultry is specially provided for in paragraph 234.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; dead poultry is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Game birds are specially provided for in paragraph 232.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not yet seem to catch the idea. I asked the Senator if it was the intention of the committee to impose a duty upon dead poultry, and impose a duty upon game birds dressed, and allow those same items—that is, poultry and game birds—to come in here free if they are preserved or prepared in any way? In other words, suppose the meat of ducks was salted, dried, or canned?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I see the Senator's point! Paragraph 234 refers to live poultry.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the point the Senator is making is that paragraph 548 would let in this poultry free.

Mr. SMOOT. If it was canned or if it was preserved; certainly. That is the point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not think that was our intention.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I ask that this paragraph may be passed over for further consideration by the committee. I did not think that was the intention.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait one second. Paragraph 232 does not need to go back to the committee. Paragraph 234 is the paragraph that needs to go back.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I am not objecting to 234.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I move, after the word "live," in paragraph 234, to insert the words "or dressed."

Mr. SMOOT. That would not cure it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I beg pardon. Wait a minute. That will not cover it at all.

Mr. SMOOT. No; that will not cure it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. "Poultry, live, 1 cent per pound; dead, 2 cents per pound." That includes all poultry, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator agrees with me in that. I am not asking now for the amendment which the Senator has just offered. I am calling the Senator's attention to the fact that paragraph 548 provides for "meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved." Dead and live poultry is assessed, and so game birds if they are dressed are assessed; but you can take game birds and preserve them; you can take dead poultry and preserve it, and then they would fall under paragraph 547 and come in free. There will be a conflict there. The Senator will no doubt remember the case of the Chinese company of New York against the United States where this question was decided. The way the bill is written the same question will arise again.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I see the point now. The point the Senator is making is that dead poultry, in paragraph 234, would refer only to poultry, dead and in its natural state, and that dead poultry, prepared or preserved, would be upon the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. It would be upon the free list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, that was not the intention of the committee. The Senator is right about it, and I ask that the latter part of paragraph 234, after the semicolon, be sent back to the committee for further consideration. I would offer the amendment now, but I am a little afraid I might not get the wording exactly right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the whole paragraph will go back. The question is on the amendment of the committee, in paragraph 233, page 62, line 18, to strike out "7" and insert "5" before "cents," so as to read, "fluid extract of meat, 5 cents per pound."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 234 is recommitted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The same thing has occurred twice. I dislike to take up the time of the Senate about it, but paragraph 234 was not recommitted. The latter part of paragraph 234, following the semicolon, was recommitted.

Mr. GRONNA. Do I understand that paragraph 234 was recommitted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to state for the benefit of the Senator from Mississippi that unless there is some good reason why the whole paragraph should not go back the Secretary has informed the Chair that it aids the clerks very materially in keeping the record to have it all go back.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It may aid the Secretary very materially in keeping the record, but it may cause very considerable trouble later on. To-day, on an earlier paragraph, we sent one subject matter with about a dozen items in the paragraph back to the committee, and the Chair later announced that we had sent the paragraph back. As far as I can lay the work behind me I want to lay it behind me. Therefore, when we send a part of a paragraph back it will not take much more pen and ink or pencil for the Secretary to note the fact that that part of the paragraph following the semicolon was sent back to the committee.

Mr. GRONNA. If the paragraph has not been recommitted, I wish to offer an amendment to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi says he wants only the last half of the paragraph to go back. Is the Senator's amendment to the first part of the paragraph?

Mr. GRONNA. I have an amendment to the entire paragraph, to change the rate from 1 cent a pound to 2 cents a pound and from 2 cents a pound to 3 cents a pound.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to let the Senate rule on that question.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from North Dakota simply want to offer an amendment to poultry live or to both items?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Both.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not think the Senator from Mississippi understood him. The Senator from North Dakota wants to offer an amendment to the entire paragraph, and under the present status the Senator from Mississippi has referred half of it back and half of it is here. The Senator from North Dakota can not offer his amendment because the amendment applies to both parts of the paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Undoubtedly it is in order because you must perfect the paragraph before you recommit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi had the last half of the paragraph referred back to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that. The amendment ought to have been offered earlier of course, before we took that action. I assume that the paragraph must be perfected before it can be sent back to the committee, either in whole or in part.

Mr. GRONNA. I call attention to the fact that paragraph 234 had not been read before I offered my amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon; it was, and the next paragraph was read. I ask that the action of the Senate recommitting a part of the paragraph be reconsidered for the present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The paragraph is now before the Senate, and it will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

234. Poultry, live, 1 cent per pound; dead, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. GRONNA. I move to amend the paragraph, so that it will read:

Poultry, live, 2 cents per pound; dead, 3 cents per pound.

Mr. President, this is a paragraph on which a great deal might be said. I know that the Senator in charge of this schedule is very anxious to proceed with the bill, and I shall not take up the time of the Senate to discuss it, but I wish to ask to have printed in the Record in connection with it a table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The table referred to is as follows:

POULTRY.

Canadian rate: 20 per cent ad valorem.
Payne rate: live poultry, 3 cents per pound; dead poultry, 5 cents per pound.

Dingley rates: Same as Payne rates.

Wilson rates: Live poultry, 2 cents per pound; dead poultry, 3 cents per pound.

Imports 1912.

	Pounds.	Value.	Revenue.
Poultry, live	417,852	\$95,714	\$12,534.70
Poultry, dead	416,195	58,460	20,899.77

Exports 1912: Poultry and game, value, \$697,955.

Number of poultry in 1910.

	Chickens and guinea fowls.	Turkeys, ducks, and geese.
United States.....	282,110,164	11,027,213
Maine.....	1,718,240	13,280
New Hampshire.....	907,807	6,950
Vermont.....	915,526	18,759
Massachusetts.....	1,715,435	38,111
Rhode Island.....	396,981	8,353
Connecticut.....	1,225,781	17,924
New York.....	10,265,939	300,755
New Jersey.....	2,342,451	59,254
Pennsylvania.....	12,007,839	347,040
Ohio.....	16,904,166	382,328
Indiana.....	13,273,585	463,364
Illinois.....	20,647,947	617,469
Michigan.....	9,724,713	202,778
Wisconsin.....	1,153,314	219,982
Minnesota.....	10,304,776	346,765
Iowa.....	22,730,118	564,669
Missouri.....	19,992,410	832,570
North Dakota.....	3,097,692	132,015
South Dakota.....	4,936,814	199,527
Nebraska.....	9,033,353	214,016
Kansas.....	15,321,486	314,575
Delaware.....	798,345	23,082
Maryland.....	2,702,403	134,098
District of Columbia.....	7,433	196
Virginia.....	5,738,011	321,930
West Virginia.....	3,121,055	181,300
North Carolina.....	4,643,447	384,000
South Carolina.....	2,778,122	139,713
Georgia.....	4,991,612	293,480
Florida.....	1,259,007	58,645
Kentucky.....	8,047,178	686,930
Tennessee.....	7,410,314	627,493
Alabama.....	4,708,474	286,233
Mississippi.....	4,671,114	373,467
Arkansas.....	5,234,957	537,028
Louisiana.....	3,291,128	226,258
Oklahoma.....	8,093,918	346,904
Texas.....	12,889,699	683,573
Montana.....	923,173	31,731
Idaho.....	1,013,401	32,016
Wyoming.....	325,365	11,002
Colorado.....	1,648,246	43,135
New Mexico.....	511,845	10,780
Arizona.....	253,118	8,023
Utah.....	673,911	14,716
Nevada.....	126,667	4,488
Washington.....	2,205,934	44,086
Oregon.....	1,756,340	51,555
California.....	5,668,974	170,858

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I now ask that the part of the paragraph after the semicolon be recommitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 236, page 63, line 8, before the word "cents," to strike out "15" and insert "20," so as to read:

Sweetened chocolate and cocoa, prepared or manufactured, not specially provided for in this section, valued at 20 cents per pound or less, 2 cents per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 236, page 63, line 9, before the word "cents," to strike out "15" and insert "20," so as to read:

Valued at more than 20 cents per pound, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in previous tariff acts and also in the present law powdered cocoa has always been provided for by itself. The present law provides for powdered cocoa, unsweetened, 5 cents a pound. After the words "ad valorem," in line 10, on page 63, I move to insert the words:

Powdered cocoa, sweetened, 3 cents per pound.

That is a reduction from 5 cents a pound in the present law to 3 cents a pound. It is a reduction of 40 per cent over the present law. I am informed by the cocoa manufacturers of the country who make this article that with a reduction less than that it is impossible for their business to live.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill to the end of paragraph 238, the last paragraph read being as follows:

238. Dandelion root, and acorns prepared, and articles used as coffee, or as substitutes for coffee not specially provided for in this section, 2 cents per pound.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, paragraph 238 puts a tariff of 2 cents per pound upon substitutes for coffee. I am thoroughly convinced if the Senators on the other side who have been voting steadily and constantly and nearly unanimously against any change in the bill would give due and fair consideration to the amendment I shall offer they would be unanimously in favor of it. I am going to move to strike out the paragraph with notice that if it prevails when we get to the free list I will move to add it there.

The substitutes for coffee ought to be on the free list. Regardless of any man's theory of the tariff, I believe if you will give due consideration to the question no one can have any other idea.

I am not going into the coffee situation now, because I admit that this amendment would not fully meet what ought to be met regarding the great International Coffee Trust, known as the Brazilian valorization scheme. But the articles in this particular paragraph come in direct contact and competition with coffee, which is itself the subject, in my judgment, of the greatest trust on earth.

It is true, I think, that even if you adopted my amendment it would not be, as I have said, a complete solution of it, but it would be a partial solution. This particular paragraph is a direct protection to the International Coffee Trust. It can not be anything else. Everything that will come in competition with coffee as long as coffee is on the free list ought to be put on the free list, because the only beneficiary of anything of that kind will be the International Coffee Trust. I am satisfied if every Member would vote as he feels when he has considered this question there would not be a single vote in the Senate against the amendment I propose.

We have imported of these substitutes for coffee at different times comparatively large quantities, although as compared with the amount of coffee we consume it is not very large. In 1910 we imported something over 452,000 pounds of these substitutes for coffee. The tariff was 2½ cents a pound under the law as it existed then and as it exists now. This bill reduces the duty just one-half cent per pound. Last year there was not so great an importation. It is estimated in the handbook here that under this rate per pound the equivalent ad valorem duty would be 16.67 per cent.

I am not offering this amendment, I should like to say to Democrats on the other side, on any theory of protection; I am not offering it on any theory of free trade; I am simply offering it to partially bring into competition, if we can, and this will

bring some competition, the great International Trust, organized in a foreign country, and that has during the last four or five years taken from the common people of the United States at least \$75,000,000 in the increased price of coffee.

If there is any reason for this tariff, if there is any reason why this amendment should not be adopted and that which comes in competition with the product of that great trust, I would be very glad to have some one suggest it. I would be glad to yield for any question connected with the subject.

I do not believe it is necessary now for me to go over the question of the International Coffee Trust and the Brazilian valorization scheme. I think in a general way that is well understood by all the Members of the Senate, and it will be the only beneficiary of this particular legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from Nebraska will pardon me, while I myself am rather inclined that he is wrong, I am rather inclined to think that, while this duty can not be defended upon revenue principles or upon protective principles, either, it could be defended upon ethical principles, to prevent frauds and substitutes of one thing for another and the sale of it as another.

Still, upon consultation, I will ask that the matter be recommitted, if that will be satisfactory to the Senator, and the committee will consider it.

Mr. GRONNA. I will ask the Senator from Mississippi if that paragraph is recommitted, whether paragraph 235 should not also be considered by the committee? Chicory is used as a substitute for coffee. Chicory is the poor man's coffee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think chicory is a positive fraud; and, if sold for coffee, it is a positive deception. It is an undeniable fraud and there is nothing good about it. As to this other matter, I want to look into the character of it. I understand there is nothing in the dandelion root that is injurious to the human system at all, although there is an amount of tannic acid which, when consumed in too large quantities, might be injurious. I want to tax chicory so that it shall not be sold to me and my children as coffee.

Mr. GRONNA. I remember the attack made on this particular article by Judge SABATH, of Chicago, a few years ago. I shall not take up the time of the Senate to discuss it, but it can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was shown by Mr. SABATH that large quantities of this article are being used as coffee. But I know it is being used by the poor people of the city and most of it is used by the farmer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know that a very great fraud is being perpetrated upon the consumer and that chicory is not a good thing for anybody to put in his stomach. I have no objection to substituting one more than another if equally harmless; but I do not think that, as a general principle, applies to chicory. I would rather send it back to the committee.

Mr. GRONNA. I objected to a duty of 2 cents a pound on chicory. That was my objection to it.

Mr. NORRIS. In connection with that matter I should like to say that, so far as my knowledge goes, this article—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have agreed to allow it to go to the committee. I think the Senator might help me sometimes.

Mr. NORRIS. But I want to make a suggestion to the Senator for his consideration when he takes it up in committee. I may be mistaken about what I am saying now, but my information is that these substitutes for coffee are not imported under the name of coffee. There is not any fraud practiced against the Government. They are not sold as real coffee. So the question the Senator raised is not involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I want to examine it. I have an impression now that they are mixed with coffee and ground with coffee and sold as pure coffee.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that could not be done under our pure-food law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If that is a mistake, I will try to find out about it.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that he will find that chicory is ground up and mixed with coffee and sold as coffee. There is no substitute for unground coffee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought not, and therefore I thought it was a fraud on the consumer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 238 is recommitted to the committee.

Mr. BURTON. I ask that paragraph 240 may go over until, say, Monday afternoon or Tuesday. It is the paragraph in regard to spices. In the meantime I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Suppose we consider the paragraph and adopt the Senate committee amendments, and then let it go over?

Mr. BURTON. The amendments are just what I should like to have considered further.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well.

Mr. BURTON. I want to ask the question, What does this provision mean on page 64, beginning with the words "ground spices"? There is an amendment of the Senate committee which I think helps the situation very much, but I should like to know how it is interpreted and what is intended by it. It reads:

Ground spices, 20 per cent ad valorem in addition to any duty on the spices in an unground state.

Does that mean that you impose on the ground spices, in addition to the ad valorem rate, the rate per pound imposed on the unground spices, or that you take the value of the unground spices and impose a duty upon them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It says "20 per cent ad valorem in addition to any duty."

Mr. BURTON. How do you compute that duty?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the duty levied is an ad valorem duty, it will be 20 per cent of the ad valorem duty added, and when the duty is a specific duty, it will be one-fifth of the specific duty added. There is no trouble about it, because it is all specific. The rate is 1 cent per pound on some, 2 cents per pound, three-fourths of 1 cent, and one-half of 1 cent; mace, 8 cents; Bombay or wild mace, 18 cents. Then, when they are ground it is just one-fifth added to each—20 per cent. That is what is intended.

Mr. BURTON. But I do not believe the Senator from Mississippi quite understands me. Take a concrete case. Suppose cinnamon is ground into spices. You would then impose 20 per cent ad valorem in addition to any duty on the cinnamon in an unground state?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, that is all right; I see now what the Senator means.

Mr. BURTON. Would you impose a duty of 1 cent a pound on the weight of the ground spice, or how would you do it?

I think perhaps it would be best to pass the matter over, and then the Senator from Mississippi will consider it. I think the language as it now stands is open to ambiguity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not see any ambiguity in it. Ground spices—

Mr. SIMMONS. As that paragraph has been passed over until Monday, what is the necessity of discussing it now? We can discuss it when we reach it on Monday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not agree to pass it over.

Mr. SIMMONS. I thought the Senator had.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agreed to pass it over after the adoption of the committee amendments. The paragraph reads:

Ground spices, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Of course, "ad valorem" means upon the value of the ground spices, and that that is to be an addition to any duty which is a specific duty on the unground spices.

Mr. BURTON. How will you figure the amount on the unground spices? Suppose it requires a pound and a quarter in its unground condition to produce a pound that is ground?

Mr. WILLIAMS. You have the tariff upon the ground spices when it comes in.

Mr. BURTON. How can you compute it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. This will operate like every other thing at the customhouse.

Mr. BURTON. I think an appraiser would have a good deal of difficulty about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The point is, whether you are going to take the weight of the ground or the unground spices?

Mr. BURTON. As to how you will fix the duty? It would hardly be possible to ascertain the quantity of unground spices.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think, after all that has been said, that the language is ambiguous. The customhouse people will have some trouble in getting the duty upon the unground spices by weight when they come to fix the duty on the ground spices ad valorem, and then to make the addition. We will carry that back into the committee and cure the difficulty.

Mr. BURTON. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not know whether or not I formally asked that paragraph 240 be passed over. Did I do so?

Mr. SIMMONS. Let it be passed over until Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over. The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read paragraph 241, as follows:

241. Vinegar, 4 cents per proof gallon. The standard proof for vinegar shall be taken to be that strength which requires 35 grains of bicarbonate of potash to neutralize 1 ounce troy of vinegar.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, this is the concluding paragraph of the schedule. I shall detain the Senate on it but a moment.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, taking 35 articles in this schedule, 15 of them have been placed on the free list. Those 15 articles are the ones which are of the greatest importance to the farmer. More than \$25,000,000 in revenue will be lost to the Treasury of the United States by this proposed change. My figures are taken from the tariff handbook. Under the present law the revenue collected for 1912 on these articles was \$32,026,260.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator from North Dakota permit me to interrupt him?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GRONNA. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from North Dakota calls attention to the fact that there will be a loss of \$25,000,000 to the Treasury of the United States. Has the Senator made any estimate as to how much the Canadian people will gain?

Mr. GRONNA. Well, Mr. President, I have not made an estimate as to what they will gain, but I can assure the Senator from New Hampshire that the Canadian people will gain a great many times the amount the Treasury of the United States will lose.

The estimated revenue to be collected under this bill, according to the Democratic tariff handbook, is \$6,739,570. You admit, according to your own figures, that there will be a loss to the Treasury of the United States of \$25,286,696. The very people to whom you denied protection upon the basic necessities you are taxing on spices. It may be that we could get along without using spices, but it is a well-known fact that they are being used by everybody. What is the difference, so far as the cost of living is concerned, whether you levy a duty upon food products or levy it upon such articles as spices? The American people pay it. There is, however, a great difference to those who are engaged in the industries and are producing these basic necessities. You permit the foreign producer to come to this country and give him the same opportunities to market his products as is given to the American farmer.

Last year there was paid out for extra labor on the farm, not mentioning the labor of the farmer himself or that of his family, over \$1,000,000,000; and yet we hear much about raw material. Last year it cost 40 cents a bushel to produce barley; 35 cents of this was labor cost, and yet you call it raw material. The glass of beer, the product of the brewer, which is most all profit, does not have in it 5 per cent of labor cost, and yet beer is protected by a heavy duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator think that American beer is very heavily protected? Is not most of the taxation a countervailing duty against the internal-revenue tax?

Mr. GRONNA. Well, Mr. President, it is protected in this bill by a duty of 100 per cent or more.

It seems to me that it is unfair to the American farmer to deny to him any protection whatever on these articles; it seems to me it is unfair to the American people to take from the Treasury of the United States more than \$25,000,000 in revenue now derived from these 35 articles. I can well understand how a free trader can justify his position in placing these articles on the free list, but I can not understand how anyone who claims to be for a tariff for revenue can justify his position, because the rates on agricultural products, according to your own figures, involve a loss of nearly \$26,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator does not want the impression to go to the country that agricultural products are all on the free list, does he?

Mr. GRONNA. No; I am referring to 35 articles.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. How does the Senator arrive at the figures—\$26,000,000—which he says will be lost by virtue of the reduction in the tariff on agricultural products?

Mr. GRONNA. I had not intended to take up so much time of the Senate, but since the Senator has asked me the question how I arrive at these figures I shall be glad to give them to him.

According to the handbook, the imports of horses for 1912 were \$335,684, which brought in a revenue of \$68,323. The proposed rate is 10 per cent, under which the estimated imports are \$475,000 and the estimated revenue \$47,500. I do not think I would be justified in taking the time of the Senate to read all of the figures which I have here.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will ask the Senator to give the total for the whole 35 products.

Mr. GRONNA. The total amount of revenue collected on these articles in 1912 was \$32,026,266, and the estimated revenue is \$6,739,570.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the Senator mean the revenue estimated to be obtained from this schedule of the pending bill?

Mr. GRONNA. The revenue on the same number of articles I have indicated.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator, then, is not speaking of all the articles in the agricultural schedule?

Mr. GRONNA. I am speaking of 35 articles or products of the farm.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from North Dakota, if he conveniently can, to select three or four of the leading articles where the loss is greatest.

Mr. GRONNA. Before I do that I want to give the Senate the exact figures of the amount of revenue that will be lost. The loss to the Government will be \$25,286,696. The articles to which I refer are horses, mules, cattle, swine, sheep, other animals, barley, oats, rice, corn, wheat, rye, broom corn, buckwheat, butter and substitutes, cheese and substitutes, beans, beets, hay, honey, hops, onions, garlic, peas, flaxseed, straw, vegetables, poultry, eggs, flax straw, fresh milk, cream, potatoes, wool, and hair of the Angora goat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. SIMMONS. Wool is not covered by the agricultural schedule, nor is the hair of the Angora goat. If the Senator will pardon me, he is laboring under some curious misapprehension. The total duty collected under this whole schedule on everything in the schedule was \$34,000,000; and it is estimated that under the Senate bill the total duties collectible will be \$21,863,000; so that, taking the whole schedule, there is a difference between the present duties and the estimated duties of less than \$13,000,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Less than \$10,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; less than \$13,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator must be mistaken in that.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am speaking of the whole schedule.

Mr. WARREN. There is more difference than that in the one matter of wool.

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, wool is not in the agricultural schedule.

Mr. WARREN. I know it is not, but the Senator from North Dakota has enumerated it as an agricultural product.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator to be talking about Schedule G.

Mr. WARREN. He has enlarged it somewhat to include other agricultural products.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood the Senator to be speaking about Schedule G, the agricultural schedule.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say to the Senator from North Carolina that my figures are correct, and I shall ask to have them printed in the Record so as to give the Senator time to investigate them; and if the Senator finds that I am mistaken, I hope he will correct me.

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course the Senator is correct when he states that there is a large loss of revenue as the result of putting raw wool on the free list; nobody denies that; just as there is a large loss of revenue from putting sugar on the free list.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I shall ask to have printed in the Record this full statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the Senator if in his statement he considers sugar to be an agricultural product or a manufactured product? It is really a very highly finished manufactured product.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that I do not happen to have sugar on my list, and I have not referred to sugar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the Senator the further question, before he puts the paper in the Record, is it his contention that the farmers have lost the amount of money he has named by the removal of the duty?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, my contention is—I hope I am mistaken, but my contention is—that they will lose a great deal more by losing the American market, which rightfully belongs to them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. Then the contention of the Senator from North Dakota is that the farmers of this country have lost in the prices they were enabled by the tariff to levy upon the American people even more than the amount of money he is stating as having been put on the free list. Admitting for the sake of argument that that contention is just; if so, then the American people have escaped that much taxation levied upon them for the benefit of special farming interests. There is no escape from it.

It is true either that the farmers have not lost the amount of taxes that we have reduced, or they have. If they have lost them, they have lost them because they have lost the power to levy, in the shape of the added price, that much tax upon the American people. If they have lost that power, the American people have profited that much—the poor and the rich, the low and the high.

I am not a political farmer. Every dollar I have in the world is invested in agriculture, directly or indirectly. Every dollar I have anywhere is either in tools, or in implements, or in cattle, or in horses, or in sheep, or in crops, or in land, or in mortgages on agricultural lands. I say I do not know of anything more iniquitous than to espouse the idea that my class has a right to levy a contribution of millions of dollars upon the necessities of the American people every year of our lives, every generation of our time, in order that we may reap greater profits. For the most part it goes to the landlord and not to the farm laborer. I belong to the landlord class, and I know it; and so does every landlord in this country.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question. I have for a long time known the belief or the contention of the Senator from Mississippi with regard to this particular industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was your contention.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to ask the Senator from Mississippi a question. How much revenue do you propose to collect under this tariff?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator mean the total amount of revenue?

Mr. GRONNA. The total amount.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have forgotten the figures. They are in the hands of the committee.

Mr. GRONNA. We have generally collected about \$300,000,000 annually, have we not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. And about the same amount, or a little more, by an internal-revenue tax. I ask the Senator from Mississippi what difference it makes whether we levy it on food products or whether we levy it on something else that the American people use?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah, I can very easily tell the Senator. When you levy a tax upon food products you levy a tax upon something which every human being—man, woman, or child—absolutely must have. It is like levying a tax upon water; it is like levying a tax upon air; it is like levying a tax upon anything without which humanity can not exist.

When you come to levying a tax upon other things, it depends upon what those other things are. If you levy a tax upon a man's necessities, you have levied a tax upon the man, his physical fabric, all there is to him. When you have levied a tax upon his comforts, you have inconvenienced him. When you have levied a tax upon his luxuries, you have "unluxuriated" him to a slight extent.

Why, it is as old Solon of Athens said, a thousand years before Christ, about a graduated income tax. He said: "If you levy a tax of 10 per cent upon a man"—he used the Greek coinage, but I shall use the American coinage—"who has \$100 a year, and take from him \$10, you deprive him of something he needs. When you take \$100, the same percentage, from him who has a thousand dollars a year, you deprive him of something that will improve him, but without which he can exist. When you take \$10,000 from a man with \$100,000 a year, still the same percentage, you deprive him of some luxuries, without which he can well live and develop."

So you never can make uniform percentage taxation, either upon incomes or upon necessities, an equal tax. You always tax the poor more than you tax the rich, not because you want to do it, but because you can not avoid it. It is absolutely unavoidable.

My principle always has been this: If I could have my way, I would divide all of the imports into the United States into three classes—necessaries of life and necessities of industry at one extreme; luxuries away out at the other extreme; between the two, the things that are comforts. I would tax them at different rates, because in taxing them at different rates I tax humanity more approximately at the same rate. Do you not understand? Or, to express it better, I tax humanity in all of its classes more nearly in proportion to humanity's ability to pay. That is the reason.

You never can begin the reform of any great tax system unless you start at the bottom—at the necessities of life and industry. Another great reason for it is that when you take the tax off the necessities of life or off a necessary of industry, especially the latter, you then have the opportunity to take off all the "compensatory" taxes that were levied on account of

it, and you have the opportunity to take off all the intermediate profits in the shape of compound interest, that accompanied it from the day it came from the mill to the time the man put it on his back, or put it in his stomach. So that every time you take off "X" from the raw product, you can take off "XY," whatever that may amount to—algebraic progression—from the finished product, and not merely "X" itself.

Mr. GRONNA. I will ask the Senator from Mississippi whether it is not true that he expects, under this bill, to collect somewhere near \$300,000,000 in customs taxes?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have forgotten the amount.

Mr. GRONNA. Is it not true that the people need clothing and wearing apparel as well as food?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but they can exist without much of the latter if the police will let them alone.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask the Senator, then, what difference does it make whether you levy a portion of that amount on the food products and a portion of it on the wearing apparel or leave it all on the wearing apparel?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, we have not levied it all upon the wearing apparel. We have not taken all the tax off the agricultural products. The assumption that we have left the farmer taxed upon the manufactured products, while we have taken off the tax upon his products, is not borne out by the bill. Take the flax schedule—

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a minute. Let us undeceive the people in connection with this.

Mr. GRONNA. I hope the Senator will not make the statement that I am trying to deceive anybody.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no; I said I wanted to undeceive them. My friend would not deceive anybody. He is as honest as the day is long. He is as clean as a hound's tooth.

Mr. GRONNA. I thank the Senator for that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But what I say is that I want the people to be undeceived about it. Take the flax schedule alone. What did we do first? We put flax upon the free list. We put hemp upon the free list. Cotton was already there. Then we went to the wool schedule, and we put wool upon the free list. What does that enable us to do? Why, it enables us to reduce the duties upon the finished products of flax 50 per cent and the duties upon the finished products of wool 35 per cent. So we have given to the farmer the opportunity to buy 50 per cent cheaper linen and 35 per cent cheaper wool, in so far as the duty raised the price; and he already had free raw material on the cotton schedule, so we were not able to reduce that quite so much.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to read to the Senator from Mississippi some of the articles in this schedule that have been placed on the free list. I want to name them.

Cattle are on the free list; swine are on the free list; sheep are on the free list; corn is on the free list; wheat is on the free list; rye is on the free list; broom corn is on the free list; buckwheat is on the free list; eggs are on the free list; flax straw is on the free list; milk and cream are on the free list; potatoes are on the free list; wool is on the free list.

I had hoped I might have the attention of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. GRONNA. I have just read to the Senate some of the articles which this bill proposes to place on the free list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I knew what they were before the Senator read them.

Mr. GRONNA. I am sure of that. I simply read them for the Record, of course. But the articles placed on the free list are those of the greatest importance to the agriculturist. I can not understand where you benefit the consumer by giving him free wheat. The people of the country do not consume whole wheat. I can not see where you are going to benefit the consumer by giving him free wheat and placing a duty upon wearing apparel or on spices.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We did not place the duty there. We reduced it.

Mr. GRONNA. You are placing a duty on it, and you are simply going on the theory that by increasing importations you will produce a sufficient amount of revenue to defray the expenses of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no. Upon the contrary, we went to an income tax in order to get the necessary revenue, taxing the wealth rather than the bellies and the backs of the people.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that if the income-tax provision of this bill stood by itself I should be glad to vote for it. I believe in an income tax. For 20 years or more I have advocated it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are advocating it now just to this extent: We are substituting it for a lot of consumption taxes; and just to the extent that we are doing it we are removing the burdens of taxation from the bellies and the backs of the people to their pocketbooks and their bank accounts.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GRONNA. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Mississippi argues that the \$25,000,000, to which the Senator from North Dakota has called attention, will go to the consumers of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Senator's pardon, but I did not. The Senator from North Dakota said the farmers would lose that much. I did not say it, and I do not believe it.

Mr. GRONNA. I said they would lose many times more than that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I said if that were true they would lose the power to tax the people that much; but I said upon the floor of the Senate the other day that in spite of the reduction of taxes meat and bread will both go up, and cattle and wheat will both go up, because of other conditions existing in this country and in the world at this time. These are conditions overmastering the natural tendency of tax reductions to reduce prices of the things taxed.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator's suggestion now is that, notwithstanding the farmer has been deprived of the protection he formerly had, under the operation of this bill the consumer will have to pay more than he does now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not a very alluring picture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, no. What I say is this: The Senator from North Dakota said the other thing, and I merely took his ground for the sake of argument and reply of any possible ground of the opposition. I say that owing to other conditions that have nothing to do with the tariff the price of the staple articles of agriculture will for quite a time continue to go up, with now and then a sag downward, but that the tendency of prices will be upward. The farmer will get just as much for his wheat and just as much for his cattle and the consumer will pay as much. The only difference is that the rise in the price of the farmer's cattle and wheat will not be what it would have been if we had not made the reduction. The reduction will counteract overmastering conditions to some extent. But as compared with present prices the prices are going up. That is my prediction. That is my belief.

Mr. GALLINGER. On every stump in my section of the country our good Democratic friends in the last campaign thrilled their audiences with the suggestion and the promise of cheaper living.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and we are going to have it. We are going to have it in the shape of cheaper iron, and cheaper woolen clothing, and cheaper cotton clothing, and cheaper linen clothing, and, generally speaking, cheaper manufactured products; but we are not going to have it in the shape of cheaper basic necessities of food products from the farm, because the great influx of people to the cities and the increased demand for food and the decreased supply, owing to the fact that labor is going from the farm to the factory all over the world, will prevent what would be the natural tendency of this act. But we are going to give the people cheaper clothing; we are going to give them cheaper plows, and agricultural implements, and bagging and ties, and wool sacks and grain bags; we are going to give them cheaper barbed-wire fences; we are going to give them all these goods cheaper, and the Senator will live to see it.

Mr. GALLINGER. The argument of the Senator from Mississippi reminds me of what occurred in my own State a few years ago. A Democratic orator grew eloquent, and, pointing to a boy on the front seat, he said, "Why, the jacket you have on is taxed 40 cents." The boy said, "That is a lie, because mother bought it for 35 cents." [Laughter.] It does not follow, because these articles are put on the free list that the consumer is going to get them for very much less, particularly if we deliver over our business into the hands of foreigners.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does that apply to agricultural products as well as to manufactured products?

Mr. GALLINGER. We will not discuss agricultural products, because the Senator from Mississippi admits that they are going to cost more, notwithstanding our people have all been promised that they were going to have cheaper living; and when that was promised, it was not cast-iron pipe. It was a cheaper breakfast table. That rang all through the country from every

stump; and the people did not think you were going to give them cast-iron pipe or barbed wire on their breakfast tables.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let us have some order. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GRONNA. Not just now; I will in a moment.

In answer to the Senator from New Hampshire, I will say that the Treasury of the United States will lose more than \$25,000,000 of revenue upon the articles I have enumerated. There is no question in my mind but that the farmer of the country will lose many times as much.

Mr. GALLINGER. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GRONNA. Because the Canadian farmer and the farmer from other foreign countries will have access to the American market, which belongs to the American farmer. I thought the Senator from Mississippi and I could agree on at least one thing, and that is that the Treasury of the United States will lose more than \$25,000,000 through the changes that have been made, or that are proposed in the present bill to be made, from the present law on those items.

Mr. President, I do not care to occupy the floor any longer. I have said all I am going to say. I asked a few minutes ago to have a table printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Permission was granted to the Senator from North Dakota.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Amount expended by farmers for labor in 1909.

United States	\$651,611,287
Maine	5,633,106
New Hampshire	3,374,126
Vermont	4,748,003
Massachusetts	12,101,959
Rhode Island	1,761,594
Connecticut	6,881,619
New York	41,312,014
New Jersey	11,097,727
Pennsylvania	25,611,838
Ohio	25,631,185
Indiana	17,682,079
Illinois	36,308,376
Michigan	19,063,082
Wisconsin	19,195,473
Minnesota	22,230,149
Iowa	24,781,592
Missouri	18,644,695
North Dakota	21,740,149
South Dakota	12,831,944
Nebraska	15,028,468
Kansas	20,567,237
Delaware	1,612,471
Maryland	8,802,172
District of Columbia	238,833
Virginia	13,354,194
West Virginia	4,035,764
North Carolina	9,220,564
South Carolina	10,770,758
Georgia	13,218,113
Florida	5,354,376
Kentucky	12,243,851
Tennessee	8,448,059
Alabama	7,454,748
Mississippi	7,162,225
Arkansas	7,654,571
Louisiana	16,704,125
Oklahoma	9,837,541
Texas	25,784,501
Montana	10,930,477
Idaho	6,701,604
Wyoming	6,174,164
Colorado	10,818,465
New Mexico	3,645,423
Arizona	2,504,984
Utah	3,169,917
Nevada	2,993,978
Washington	15,370,931
Oregon	11,101,864
California	49,976,199

Revenues from duties on farm products in 1912, and estimated revenues from duties on farm products under tariff bill as reported to Senate.

Article.	Imports, 1912.	Revenue, 1912.	Proposed rate.	Estimated imports.	Estimated revenue.
Horses	\$335,684	\$68,323	10 per cent.	\$475,000	\$47,500
Mules	53,053	34,590	do.	137,300	13,750
Cattle	4,486,306	1,214,481	Free		
Swine	10,832	1,497	do.		
Sheep	123,832	20,326	do.		
Other animals	79,497	15,880	10 per cent.	100,000	10,000
Barley	1,929,214	830,542	15 cents.	1,300,000	300,000
Oats	1,053,609	408,156	6 cents.	945,000	162,000
Rice	4,185,086	1,323,338	Various	3,970,000	853,000
Corn	47,858	8,098	Free		
Wheat	998,014	352,245	do.		
Rye	111,323	13,395	do.		
Broom corn	157,969	4,024	do.		
Buckwheat	15,967	3,025	do.		

Revenues from duties on farm products in 1912, etc.—Continued.

Article.	Imports, 1912.	Revenue, 1912.	Proposed rate.	Estimated imports.	Estimated revenue.
Butter and substitutes.	\$236,483	\$60,337	2½ cents per pound.	\$325,000	\$32,500
Cheese and substitutes.	8,683,947	2,760,900	do.	11,000,000	375,000
Beans	1,456,656	371,252	25 cents per bushel.	1,600,000	250,000
Beets	147,466	15,095	5 per cent.	153,000	7,500
Hay	6,472,376	2,796,855	\$2 per ton	9,000,000	2,400,000
Honey	51,706	16,284	10 cents per gallon.	60,000	11,000
Hops	2,223,895	477,313	16 cents per pound.	1,575,000	560,000
Onions	1,233,907	572,819	20 cents per bushel.	1,350,000	360,000
Garlic	283,259	93,332	1 cent per pound.	275,000	90,000
Peas	1,897,707	299,709	Various	1,661,500	116,070
Flaxseed	13,048,513	1,718,065	15 cents per bushel.	11,000,000	900,000
Straw	56,891	15,402	50 cents per ton.	75,000	7,500
Vegetables	1,035,163	262,633	15 per cent.	1,505,000	225,750
Poultry	154,175	33,344	Various	156,000	18,000
Eggs	150,986	54,935	Free		
Flax straw	6,990	853	do.		
Milk, fresh	6,283	936	do.		
Cream	923,787	56,012	do.		
Potatoes	7,175,376	3,434,535	do.		
Wool	33,141,408	14,454,234	do.		
Hair of Angora goat, etc.	632,330	243,591	do.		
Total		32,026,206			6,739,570

Estimated revenue and estimated imports taken from tariff handbook prepared by Finance Committee. Fruits not included in above statement. Where the article is placed on the free list the handbook contains no estimate as to probable imports.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, that finishes this schedule, I think, except for some paragraphs that have been passed over. I ask that the bill may be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. BACON. If the bill is laid aside and there is no other matter of a pressing nature—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought probably the Senator from Georgia would make a motion to go into executive session.

Mr. BACON. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then we may as well adjourn.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 18, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

Monday, August 18, 1913.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dillingham	McLean	Simmons
Bacon	Fall	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Borah	Gallinger	Norris	Sterling
Brady	Gronna	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Hollis	Page	Swanson
Bristow	Hughes	Perkins	Thomas
Bryan	James	Pittman	Thompson
Burton	Johnson	Pomerene	Thornton
Catron	Jones	Robinson	Tillman
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Saulsbury	Townsend
Chilton	Kern	Shafroth	Weeks
Clapp	La Follette	Sheppard	Williams
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Shields	
Crawford	Lodge	Shively	

Mr. JAMES. My colleague [Mr. BRADLEY] is detained from presence here by reason of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT].

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is necessarily absent on account of sickness in his family. He is paired with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS].